

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 26, 1989

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. Fred C. Lofton, pastor, Metropolitan Baptist Church, Memphis, TN, offered the following prayer:

O, Thou who art pure spirit, in Thee all things have their being, and because of Thee, we are. We enter then, this moment of prayer with our spirits thirsting and seeking for Thee for divine guidance. Like the disciples, we hunger for Thee, and we say like they said, "Lord, teach us to pray; teach us Thy way."

With heads bowed and contrite hearts, grant unto us the freshness of Your forgiveness. Help us to learn to do justly, love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee.

We pray this day for the families of those gallant young men who lost their lives on the U.S.S. *Iowa*.

Grant divine power to our leaders with courage, conviction, and charity. Give them wisdom and knowledge to make wise decisions which will guide this great Nation to new heights as the leader of the democracies of the West. In His name who has no name. Amen and amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 288, nays 105, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—288

Ackerman	Anthony	Bartlett
Akaka	Applegate	Bates
Alexander	Archer	Bennett
Anderson	Atkins	Bereuter
Andrews	AuCoin	Berman
Annuzio	Barnard	Bevill

Bilbray	Hertel	Panetta
Boggs	Hoagland	Parker
Bonior	Hochbrueckner	Patterson
Borski	Hopkins	Payne (NJ)
Boucher	Horton	Payne (VA)
Boxer	Houghton	Pease
Brennan	Hoyer	Pelosi
Brooks	Hubbard	Penny
Browder	Huckaby	Perkins
Brown (CA)	Hughes	Pickett
Bruce	Hutto	Pickle
Bustamante	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Byron	Johnson (SD)	Poshard
Campbell (CA)	Johnston	Price
Campbell (CO)	Jones (GA)	Pursell
Cardin	Jones (NC)	Quillen
Carper	Jontz	Rahall
Clarke	Kanjorski	Rangel
Clement	Kaptur	Ravenel
Clinger	Kasich	Ray
Coelho	Kastenmeier	Regula
Coleman (MO)	Kennedy	Ritter
Coleman (TX)	Kennelly	Robinson
Combest	Kildee	Roe
Conte	Klecza	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Kostmayer	Rowland (CT)
Costello	Lancaster	Rowland (GA)
Coyne	Lantos	Roybal
Darden	Laughlin	Russo
Davis	Leath (TX)	Sabo
de la Garza	Lehman (CA)	Saiki
DeFazio	Lehman (FL)	Sangmeister
Dellums	Leland	Sarpalius
Derrick	Lent	Savage
DeWine	Levin (MI)	Sawyer
Dicks	Levine (CA)	Saxton
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Scheuer
Donnelly	Lipinski	Schiff
Dorgan (ND)	Livingston	Schneider
Downey	Lloyd	Schulze
Duncan	Long	Schumer
Durbin	Luken, Thomas	Sharp
Dwyer	Manton	Shaw
Dymally	Markey	Shumway
Dyson	Martinez	Shuster
Eckart	Matsui	Sisisky
Edwards (CA)	Mavroules	Skaggs
Engel	Mazzoli	Skeen
English	McCloskey	Skelton
Erdreich	McCollum	Slattery
Espy	McCurdy	Slaughter (NY)
Evans	McDade	Smith (FL)
Fascell	McDermott	Smith (IA)
Fazio	McEwen	Smith (NE)
Fish	McHugh	Smith (VT)
Flippo	McMillen (MD)	Solarz
Florio	McNulty	Spence
Foglietta	Meyers	Spratt
Foley	Mfume	Staggers
Ford (MI)	Miller (WA)	Stallings
Ford (TN)	Mineta	Stark
Frank	Moakley	Stenholm
Frost	Mollohan	Stokes
Gallo	Montgomery	Studds
Gaydos	Moody	Swift
Gejdenson	Morella	Synar
Gephardt	Morrison (CT)	Tallon
Gibbons	Morrison (WA)	Tanner
Gillmor	Mrazek	Tauzin
Gilman	Murtha	Thomas (GA)
Gingrich	Myers	Torres
Glickman	Nagle	Torricelli
Gonzalez	Natcher	Trafficant
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Traxler
Gradison	Neal (NC)	Udall
Grant	Nelson	Unsoeld
Gray	Nielson	Valentine
Green	Nowak	Vander Jagt
Guarini	Oakar	Vento
Gunderson	Oberstar	Visclosky
Hamilton	Obey	Volkmer
Hammerschmidt	Olin	Walgren
Harris	Ortiz	Walsh
Hawkins	Owens (NY)	Watkins
Hayes (IL)	Owens (UT)	Waxman
Hayes (LA)	Packard	Weiss
Hefner	Pallone	Weldon

Whitten	Wise	Wylie
Williams	Wolpe	Yates
Wilson	Wyden	Yatron

NAYS—105

Armey	Henry	Rhodes
Baker	Hiler	Ridge
Ballenger	Holloway	Roberts
Barton	Hunter	Rogers
Bentley	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Inhofe	Roth
Boehrlert	Ireland	Roukema
Broomfield	Jacobs	Schaefer
Brown (CO)	James	Schroeder
Buechner	Kolbe	Schuette
Bunning	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Burton	Lagomarsino	Shays
Chandler	Leach (IA)	Sikorski
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Coughlin	Lewis (FL)	Smith (MS)
Cox	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Craig	Lowery (CA)	Smith, Denny
Crane	Lukens, Donald	(OR)
Dannemeyer	Machtley	Smith, Robert
DeLay	Marlenee	(NH)
Dickinson	Martin (IL)	Smith, Robert
Douglas	Martin (NY)	(OR)
Dreier	McCandless	Snowe
Edwards (OK)	McCrery	Solomon
Emerson	McGrath	Stangeland
Fawell	McMillan (NC)	Stearns
Fields	Michel	Stump
Frenzel	Miller (OH)	Sundquist
Gallely	Molinar	Tauke
Gekas	Moorhead	Thomas (CA)
Goss	Murphy	Upton
Grandy	Oxley	Vucanovich
Hancock	Parris	Weber
Hansen	Pashayan	Whittaker
Hastert	Paxon	Wolf
Hefley	Petri	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—40

Aspin	Dixon	Lowey (NY)
Bateman	Dorman (CA)	Madigan
Beilenson	Early	Miller (CA)
Billirakis	Feighan	Pepper
Bosco	Flake	Richardson
Bryant	Garcia	Rinaldo
Callahan	Goodling	Rose
Carr	Hall (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Chapman	Hall (TX)	Towns
Clay	Hatcher	Walker
Collins	Herger	Wheat
Cooper	Jenkins	Young (FL)
Courter	Kolter	
Crockett	LaFalce	

□ 1025

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] to come forward and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Mrs. MORELLA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

THE REVEREND DR. FRED C. LOFTON

(Mr. FORD of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to address the House today and I am very pleased to welcome to the House of Representatives Dr. Fred C. Lofton, pastor of the Metropolitan Baptist Church, Memphis, TN.

Dr. Lofton's accomplishments and scholarly activities have been impressive as he has shaped the thought and spurred the actions of the evangelical community.

The Reverend Lofton has been pastor of the Metropolitan Baptist Church for the past 17 years. He is presently president of the Progressive National Convention.

Dr. Lofton received his bachelors of arts degrees from Morehouse College in Atlanta, GA, a masters of divinity from the Morehouse School of Religion, and masters of education from the University of Southern California, and a doctor of sacred theology from Emory University.

He is the author of four books: "Help Me Somebody," "Our Help in Ages Past," "Teach Us To Pray," and "When We Pray."

I welcome Dr. Lofton to the House of Representatives today, and wish to say that he has been a pastor of the Metropolitan Baptist Church for the past 17 years. We all know him as a great leader and a great spiritual leader in our community. I welcome him here today.

GOOD NEWS FOR THE MERCHANT MARINE

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we have some good news for the U.S. merchant marine, which soon should mean new business.

After some very hard battles waged by myself and the Federal Maritime Administration, the Department of Defense has come out with a proposed rule that lives up to the spirit of the Cargo Preference Act of 1904.

Under the proposed rule being promulgated, DOD will utilize U.S.-flag shipping for the ocean transportation of all purchased supplies and material, including components.

I want to take this opportunity to personally thank Mrs. Eleanor Spector, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Procurement and Mr. S. Thomas Romeo, Chief of the Federal Maritime Administration's Division of National Cargo, for their fine work in developing the Defense Federal acquisition regulations.

Mr. Speaker, these new regulations have the potential for generating \$250 million in new annual revenues for the U.S.-flag fleet. Every dollar spent by DOD for U.S. ocean transportation requirements will return 75 cents to the U.S. economy, thus having a positive impact on our balance of payments.

On the other hand, 78 cents of every 1 dollar spent by our military when employing foreign-flag vessels benefits foreign economies.

Mr. Speaker, these new regulations culminates a 15-year effort by the Maritime Administration in its attempts to protect and promote U.S. shipping interests, and an effort that I have been personally waging for many years even before my election in the Congress in 1984.

□ 1030

MUNICIPAL FUNDING TO FIGHT DRUGS

(Mr. JONES of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, of all the challenges faced by the American people in the late 20th century, none is more important than the battle against the drug epidemic which has infested every level of life in these United States.

We are awash in a devastating flood of dangerous drugs—from schoolyards to boardrooms, the cancer grows: the statistics are appalling. We are losing the war on drugs—and losing badly.

The sickness, the violence and the death which accompany the insanity of drug addiction is destroying the minds of our youth and the fiber of a sane and civilized society.

The American people are crying out for help, Mr. Speaker. We must provide it—at whatever sacrifice. We must meet this enemy at every level with our fullest commitment, and we must win. The alternative is intolerable.

I join my colleagues today in calling for real and adequate antidrug funding for our troubled communities.

INTRODUCTION OF COAST GUARD USER FEES AND FREE RIDE TERMINATION ACT OF 1989

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is that time of year again. Time for the covers to come off, the motors to rev up, and the sails to unfurl, because just as sure as the birds fly north every spring, the recreational boaters are making that annual migration to the sea. You can see them out on their yachts and cabin cruisers, practicing their nautical terms like "hard to port," "take the

helm, mate," and "where's the gas gauge?"

In honor of this yearly exodus, I am introducing my Coast Guard User Fee and Free Ride Termination Act of 1989. The Coast Guard protects recreational boaters from the hazards of the waters, and each other. But who compensates the Coast Guard?

Not the recreational boaters, no sir. Two hundred and fifty million citizens subsidize the recreational pleasure of the 6 million boaters who benefit from the Coast Guard's services. That is not right.

It is time to ask those who benefit to shoulder some of the responsibility, and my bill does just that by assessing a modest, \$25 user fee on those recreational boaters, with the proceeds going to the Coast Guard.

I urge my colleagues to stop tacking against the wind, and to join me in passing this bill.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS NEED FUNDING

(Mr. BRENNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support the supplemental appropriations bill.

Among other things, this legislation will provide much-needed emergency funds to the health care account of the Veterans' Administration.

I am sure that all of my colleagues know of the serious shortfall of funds that has forced VA medical centers across the country to cutback on services to veterans.

The only VA hospital in my home State of Maine has been forced to close wards, shut down beds, and turn away veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental bill will take the first step toward restoring the necessary funding for our veterans' hospitals.

It will not solve all the problems, such as adequate pay for VA nurses, but it will be a start.

The funding made available will reopen surgical and psychiatric wards, reopen drug and alcohol abuse treatment facilities and, most important, give back to our veterans the peace of mind they enjoyed before this budget crisis.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans deserve the best medical care we can provide.

If we as a nation hope to call brave men and women to the service of their country in the future, we must not forget the brave men and women who answered that call in the past.

I urge support for H.R. 2072 and the supplemental funds for the VA that it provides.

UPHOLD ROE VERSUS WADE

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today the Supreme Court will hear arguments in the case of Webster versus Reproductive Health Services. This case could be used to overturn the Roe versus Wade decision which has stood since 1973 and has protected a women's right of reproductive choice.

One hundred and forty Members of Congress signed an amicus brief expressing our strong support for the upholding of Roe versus Wade in the case to be heard today. In the brief, we conclude:

There is no precedent in the two hundred years of this Court's history for overruling a decision recognizing a fundamental right. Roe versus Wade recognized a fundamental right solidly based in constitutional principles and precedent. There are present here none of the reasons, such as changed circumstances or legal doctrine, relied on by this Court in the past for departing from the principles of stare decisis. We urge, therefore, that Roe versus Wade should be reaffirmed, as it was in 1983 and 1986, in Akron and Thronburgh, and that the debate over the continued validity of its core principles be put to rest.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that a women's reproductive choice be preserved, and I urge my colleagues to join in efforts to protect this vital freedom.

URGING SUPPORT FOR
SPEAKER WRIGHT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, our Speaker wrote a book. Certain Republicans called it a "sham." The Speaker's wife happened to get a job. Certain Republicans called that a "sham."

Meanwhile, Mr. GINGRICH of Georgia wrote a book, his wife got \$10,000 to cut the deal, and certain Republicans now call that "business."

Let us check this out. Twenty-two investors with legislative interests gave \$5,000 each to promote Mr. GINGRICH's book. In addition, his wife got \$10,000 to cut that deal, and Mr. GINGRICH said, "Well, that's not unusual." I say it stinks. It seems to me that Mr. GINGRICH's book, "The Window of Opportunity," appears more like "the closet full of cash," and with some skeletons in there as well.

I say the truth is that the Speaker is the subject of a Republican witch hunt and Democrats should stand their ground here in this House and let it be perfectly clear that there still is a Democratic Party. I say, "People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones."

LEGISLATION TO SPUR THE PRIVATE SECTOR LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE MARKET

(Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that our Nation's nursing home population will double to 2.2 million within the next 10 years. As the need for nursing home care increases, the cost of financing such care, and the need to find new ways to afford it, will also increase dramatically.

I am introducing two bills today to help individuals finance long-term care, and to help expand the market for this insurance. The first bill would permit holders of individual life insurance policies to exchange or convert the cash value of these policies for long-term care insurance on a tax-free basis. Similarly, the second bill would permit tax-free withdrawals from individual retirement accounts (IRA's) when the funds are used to pay long-term care insurance premiums.

A recent survey concluded that almost three-quarters of Americans are willing and able to buy a long-term care insurance policy. Congress should give this market a push by providing incentives to individuals to purchase long-term care policies early.

DRUG FUNDING, 1989 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

(Mr. ENGLISH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress is asking the administration to play a game of truth or consequences. As we consider the supplemental appropriations measure before us, we need to emphasize that avoiding the truth will lead to severe consequences.

In this measure, we are requesting \$822 million to continue the fight against the drug menace facing our country. This is not new money, Mr. Speaker. It is funds authorized by the 1988 Omnibus Anti-Drug Act, which called for a total has been appropriated, and even if this supplemental is approved, we still will not have reached the halfway point in fulfilling our commitment.

But it is an indispensable first step. To effectively fight the war on drugs—both on the supply and demand fronts—we need resources; we need to breathe life into the outstanding blueprint crafted last year.

Keep in mind that the drug empire takes in roughly \$150 billion a year. That is half what this country spends on its national defense. Given the fact that we spent only \$3.6 billion explicitly on antidrug programs in 1988, it is

pretty clear that we have much work to do.

The Bush administration, though, like its predecessor, thinks this war can be fought with smoke and mirrors—cheap ones at that. The consequences of that attitude will be devastating. We must pass this measure today and make the President tell the truth—does he want a drug war or not?

□ 1040

DRUG CRIME

(Mr. ORTIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, the issue of drug-related crime consistently ranks as the foremost domestic concern of many Americans in public opinion polls, and for good reason.

Not only does the use of drugs rob our society of its potential on the individual level, but the crime spawned by the drug trade takes a terrible toll in human terms as well.

Resources that could be better used elsewhere are diverted to apprehending, trying, and incarcerating drug offenders.

While we all recognize the ultimate importance of education and prevention, we must also remain committed to providing adequate resources for law enforcement.

Effective education and prevention programs offer the long-term key to a drug-free America, while sound law enforcement will send a clear message that the criminal activity which supports the drug trade will not be tolerated by our society.

We cannot allow our dedication to waver, for our ultimate potential as a people hangs in the balance.

TAKING MONEY AWAY FROM A SUCCESSFUL DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the statement that was just made to the effect that we need to pass this supplemental for the purpose of carrying on the drug war is not accurate. The facts are that we have involved the military, we have passed the language that has been signed by the President that gives the Department of Defense the lead agency role in stopping drug planes and drug ships. General Olmstead just reported to the Committee on Armed Services that they are now turning back drug planes at the southern border of the United States, and they are doing that with operation and maintenance moneys.

Mr. Speaker, this supplemental, and particularly the Foley amendment, will cut into operations and maintenance of the Department of Defense, and it is going to hamper the very drug interdiction measures that this Congress has just mandated be started up. In particular military personnel are going to be cut \$448 million under Foley. Operations and maintenance will be cut \$490 million, so we are taking away from a successful interdiction drug program on the one hand to pass out money with the other hand.

OPPOSITION TO CUTTING FUNDING FOR OMNIBUS ANTIDRUG BILL

(Mr. LEVINE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose efforts to cut funding for the omnibus antidrug bill and to urge the administration to declare Los Angeles a high-impact drug area.

Los Angeles has the unhappy distinction of being the Nation's drug and gang capital. Los Angeles gangs are now exporting drugs and violence to the rest of the country. According to the FBI, Los Angeles gangs are operating in over 40 cities throughout the United States.

Last session my colleague Mr. BERMAN and I introduced legislation to create a Los Angeles Drug Gang Task Force. We estimated that Los Angeles needed 699 new Federal law enforcement personnel, for the DEA, FBI, ATF, Customs, Coast Guard, U.S. Attorneys, and the INS.

In response the administration has agreed to provide 8 new DEA agents and 21 new Federal prosecutors. This is an important first step, but it is not enough. Much more needs to be done if we are to reclaim our homes and streets from crime and violence.

I urge my colleagues to provide law enforcement with the tools necessary to turn the tide in the war against drugs.

WE SHOULD PLACE THE EMPHASIS ON TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION

(Mr. SARPALIUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, 14 years ago I received a phone call from a doctor who told me that my mother had just died as a result of an overdose of drugs. It hurt, but the sad thing was that I knew it was going to happen, and she knew it was going to happen. She wanted help, but there was no place to help her. I can remember hitchhiking to different treatment

facilities with her, and nobody would take her because there was a waiting list of 3 to 5 years long, or it was necessary to have a large amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, the sad thing is that 90 percent of the drug addicts in this country who want help are turned away simply because we do not have enough facilities in this country. No one of us likes to see a child being abused, but 80 percent of the child abuse cases in this country are caused by a person who is intoxicated by either alcohol or drugs.

Mr. Speaker, we must address the supply and demand. If this country is every going to get serious about the drug problem, we must put emphasis on treatment and rehabilitation.

SUPPORTING OUR ANTIDRUG INITIATIVES

(Mr. AKAKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, we will be considering the dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989 today, and contained within the bill is an appropriation of national significance—funds to augment our antidrug initiatives.

H.R. 2072 includes \$822 million to assist law enforcement efforts in reducing this menace. This money is imperative if we are to carry out the directives of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, and support the efforts of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

Congress made a commitment to fight this battle when it passed the omnibus drug bill last year. Mr. Speaker, let's not be accused of only political rhetoric in having declared a drug war. If Congress is to be taken seriously by drug criminals, we must flex some muscle and fund our plans of counter-attack.

Illicit drug dealing is a \$140 billion business in this country; and it costs our Nation \$100 billion in higher health costs, drug-related crime and violence and lost productivity. Regular users of marijuana amount to 25 million people, while 15 million are occasional users; 30 million are occasional users of cocaine; and 7 million people abuse psychotropic substances.

The funds appropriated in today's bill will confirm our dedication in moving forward to arrest this dreaded disease.

President Bush pledged that the scourge of drugs would stop. I call on the President to show his commitment and my colleagues to show our commitment by supporting this appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote "no" on any initiative to reduce the drug funds in this bill. We cannot expect

top-of-the-line drug enforcement with underfunded programs at bargain basement prices.

THIS IS A VERY SAD DAY

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, when I was a student at Harvard Law School, my toes absolutely tingled at the thought of being able to work for the U.S. Justice Department. Those were the days of "Mississippi Burning," and the U.S. Justice Department was out front expanding rights for people and letting everyone be a player, making constitutional rights realities. Today I cringe as the U.S. Justice Department turns its back on that long tradition and the U.S. Attorney General goes to the Supreme Court asking to retrench on rights for American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very sad day, and I must say I am very upset that the U.S. Justice Department is moving in that direction.

I am proud of the many Justice attorneys who have asked the Attorney General not to do this, but I hope we reclaim where we were in the past and see ourselves as expanding rights, not asking to take people's rights away. I certainly regret the fact that they felt they had to get involved in the Roe versus Wade overturn decision.

TWO VERY IMPORTANT VOTES TODAY

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, the vote that we will be casting on the rule to the supplemental and on the supplemental itself will be two of the most important votes of this Congress. If my colleagues are serious about dealing with the drug problem in this country, they will vote yes on the rule and yes on the supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, the drug turf war has exploded throughout our Nation's cities, and this administration says it has a zero tolerance for drugs, but it is not willing to provide the weapons to fight the war on drugs. Anybody can talk tough on drugs, but are we willing to back up our local law enforcement to put the pushers behind bars and to provide treatment facilities to kick the habit? This is the bottom line.

Mr. Speaker, today Democrats in the House take the lead on the war on drugs by providing \$820 million for law enforcement and antidrug initiatives in the emergency supplemental. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will vote to cut that number in half.

If my colleagues want to be tough on drugs, if my colleagues want to put the criminals behind bars, where they belong, vote yes on the rule and vote yes on the supplemental.

IN ALL FAIRNESS THE GENTLEMAN FROM GEORGIA, MR. GINGRICH, SHOULD CLARIFY THESE COZY ARRANGEMENTS

(Mr. SMITH of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we learned that the second highest ranking member of the leadership on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], accepted cash payments, reimbursements, and in other ways was the recipient of largesse showered upon him by a group of friends, investors, and campaign supporters. We now know the identities of the members of the COS Limited Partnership which provided a \$105,000 promotion fund for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and which netted his wife nearly \$10,000. We now know that members of the COS Partnership, who invested \$5,000 each, also contributed directly to his Federal campaign fund. We now know that several of these investors and campaign contributors had direct interest in Federal legislation; he admitted it, as recipients of substantial Federal grants.

□ 1050

We now know there is some connection between individuals involved with Congressman GINGRICH's first book deal from the Nomanhan partnership which personally netted him \$13,000 for a book that he never published.

I think it is time that he starts applying the same standards to himself that he seeks to apply to others. I believe the gentleman should himself in pursuit of such consistency request that the Ethics Committee currently considering the charges against him consider the appointment of an outside counsel to clarify at least these questions that surround these cozy arrangements, and if he does not do so, I hope the committee does it themselves, in all fairness.

THE INCREASE IN DRUG-RELATED CRIME

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the dramatic increase in drug-related crime that my district of San Francisco, and many other urban areas, are now experiencing. Our city streets

have become the battleground for warring drug gangs.

Our mayor and local authorities are making a tremendous effort to contain the problem, and just last week churches, families and experts came together under the auspices of Cecil Williams and the Glide Memorial Church to make an assault on crack.

We cannot wait any longer, though, to fund and implement a national policy. I would like to remind President Bush and his drug czar, Mr. Bennett, that nationwide we lost 11,000 people to drugs and drug-related crime in 1987 alone. In that same year, Americans spent an estimated \$140 billion to purchase illicit narcotics. These numbers continue to rise.

The waiting period to receive drug treatment can be as long as 6 months. People are being turned away as they seek help. Our hospitals are experiencing an alarming increase in the number of babies born with drug-related complications.

Please help us save our children, provide treatment, cut the supply, reduce the demand through education, and offer legitimate economic alternatives to our Nation's deserving urban poor.

Vote "yes" on the supplemental.

IN SUPPORT OF DRUG SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING BILL

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2072, the fiscal year 1989 supplemental appropriations bill. It contains much needed funding for the omnibus antidrug bill which Congress enacted last year.

I would like at this point to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary of the Appropriations Committee, and the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], as well as the ranking member, for expediting this bill and for their diligence in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the drug scourge is laying waste to an entire generation of Americans. This is especially evident in the inner cities of our Nation, but drugs are a reality everywhere in America.

We need a coordinated national effort, such as that provided by the programs authorized under the omnibus antidrug bill of 1988 to help fight this battle, and to fight the battle we need the funds appropriated by this supplemental bill, so that the funds can flow to our law enforcement agencies around the Nation who today are fighting, at best, a rear guard action against drugs.

Mr. Speaker, they need these funds to go on the offensive against drugs. We need to pass the bill today and have it signed into law swiftly.

THE BASIC RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, over 100 Members of Congress recently called on the Supreme Court in two amicus briefs to overturn Roe versus Wade and recognize the basic fact that unborn children are human, that unborn children are alive, and are entitled to the most basic of all human rights, the right to life.

Mr. Speaker, medical advances in recent years have eliminated any remaining doubt one might have regarding the humanity of the unborn. Abortion methods include literal dismemberment in D&C and D&E abortions, and chemical poisoning whereby salt solutions and other chemicals are introduced into the baby's embryonic sac, literally killing and poisoning that child, resulting in death.

Mr. Speaker, the court should vacate Roe versus Wade. It has reversed itself over 100 times on constitutional questions over the years; so stare decisis is not a defense.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 137

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 137.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ACCESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS CORRECTION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 678) to make a correction in the Education and Training for a Competitive America Act of 1988, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR A COMPETITIVE AMERICA ACT OF 1988.

Section 6142(b) of the Education and Training for a Competitive America Act of 1988 is amended by striking "fiscal year 1988" and inserting "fiscal year 1989 and

such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992".

SEC. 2. IMPACT AID.

(a) **FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.**—Section 2 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Act") is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (d):

"(d) Any payment made to a local educational agency for any fiscal year prior to 1987 that is attributable to an incorrect determination under subsection (a)(1)(C) shall be deemed to have been made in accordance with such subsection."

(b) **AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.**—(1) Section 3(d)(2) of the Act is amended by inserting before subparagraph (B) a new subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

"(A) for any fiscal year after September 30, 1988, the total amount of payments under subparagraph (B) may not exceed \$20,000,000."

(2) Section 3(d)(2)(B) of the Act is amended—

(A) in the third sentence by striking "80" and inserting "95"; and

(B) by striking the seventh sentence.

(c) **PAYMENT PRORATION AUTHORITY.**—Section 5(c)(4) of the Act is amended by striking "under clause (ii) or (iii) of paragraph (2)(B), or clause (ii) or (iii) of paragraph (3)(B), respectively, the full amount which local educational agencies are entitled to receive under such clauses" and inserting in lieu thereof "under paragraph (2)(B) or paragraph (3)(B), respectively, the full amounts that local educational agencies are entitled to receive under such paragraphs".

(d) **PAYMENTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**—Section 5(e)(1)(A) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) for any fiscal year after September 30, 1988, the Secretary shall allocate, to any local educational agency eligible for a payment under section 3(a), not less than the product of—

"(i) the number of children in average daily attendance for the fiscal year for which the determination is made under section 3(a); and

"(ii) (I) if such agency received a payment under section 3(a) in fiscal year 1987, the per pupil amount paid to that agency in fiscal year 1987; or

"(II) if such agency did not receive such a payment in fiscal year 1987, the per pupil amount such agency would have been paid in fiscal year 1987 if such agency had been eligible for payments under section 3(a) and the average daily attendance for such agency for fiscal year 1987 had been equal to the average daily attendance for such agency for the first fiscal year succeeding fiscal year 1988 for which a determination is made under section 3(a)."

(e) **DISCRETIONARY ALLOCATIONS.**—Paragraph (3) of section 5(e) of the Act is amended by inserting the words "subparagraph (B) of" after "under".

(f) **APPLICATION DEADLINE.**—The Secretary shall consider as timely filed, and shall process for payment, an application from a local educational agency that is eligible for fiscal year 1989 funds under section 2 or 3 of the Act, if such application has been certified by the State educational agency, was received by the Secretary by March 15, 1989, and is otherwise approvable."

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 312(7) of the Adult Education Act is amended by striking

"and except for the purposes of section 313,".

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill as it has come back from the Senate. H.R. 678 corrects a technical error that was made in the conference report on the trade bill last year. In the report, the Access Demonstration Programs were inadvertently authorized for only 1 year. This technical correction increases that to a 4-year authorization.

As indicated, the Senate has added two technical sections, amending the impact aid provisions of the Adult Education Act. Those are in fact technical in nature.

These Senate amendments correct unanticipated technical problems with the distribution of funds, resulting from changes in these programs in the last Congress.

The impact aid technical amendments gives the Secretary of Education authority to make ratable reductions to "B" districts when appropriations levels necessitate such action. Without this authority, there will be no "B" payments made this fiscal year. The impact aid program is further amended to protect heavily impacted 3(d)(2)(B) districts, by providing additional funding for newly enrolled students.

The amendments also make a technical change to restore adult education funding in the trust territories to its previous level, by providing a share of reallocated, excess funds to adult education programs in these territories. To prevent a significant reduction in funding for the territories, this restoration of previous law allows territories to be counted in the allocation of funds in the States distribution formula.

Mr. Speaker, I support the chairman and look forward to expeditious passage this morning on the floor of this important technical bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today we consider H.R. 678, with several amendments added to it by our colleagues in the Senate.

This body passed H.R. 678 by voice vote under suspension on March 7 of

this year. Last week the Senate passed the bill and sent it back to us after adding several amendments to it. Today I urge my colleagues to pass the bill with these Senate amendments.

Let me give you a quick explanation of what H.R. 678 does, and what the Senate amendments do. First, H.R. 678 as passed by the House simply made a technical correction to last year's trade bill. It was a noncontroversial amendment that merely restored the authorization for the Access Demonstration Program of the trade bill through fiscal year 1992 as was intended by the Congress. This authorization had been mistakenly limited to fiscal year 1988 when the trade bill conference report was drafted.

When this bill reached the Senate, that body became aware of several technical problems with the impact aid program and with the adult education program. Those two programs were reauthorized last Congress, and in the implementation of those reauthorizations several previously unanticipated problems occurred. The amendments added by the Senate resolved those problems. These amendments have been developed by Members of the Senate and the appropriate House Members on both sides of the aisle, and I can assure my House colleagues that these amendments are necessary and that they are acceptable.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 678 with the Senate amendments.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished ranking minority member the situation of a school district in my congressional district which because of a bureaucratic interpretation has been denied receiving impact aid which it has been receiving since the early 1960's, some 29 years ago. I had been hoping to rectify this injustice in this bill, but I do not want to open the bill or delay the proceedings.

The distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member have assured me that they would be willing to work with me to try to rectify this injustice in this legislation. I just wanted to confirm that understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a minute to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this matter to our attention, an area in his district that is indeed troubled by what has every appear-

ance of being a bureaucratic snafu, and no more than that.

The gentleman is being very generous and patient in trying to work out this matter with the executive branch. Both the minority and I appreciate the willingness of the gentleman from Pennsylvania not to delay the legislation before us to take care of his problem, but rather to try to do it in another, although expeditious manner. I want to assure the gentleman that we are going to attempt to do everything we can to see that his problem is resolved.

□ 1100

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing to our attention his concerns in his school districts, and I think I certainly support the chairman's attempt here to accommodate the gentleman. We appreciate his understanding and letting us pass this bill. We look forward to working with him to resolve this issue in his district.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman and the distinguished minority member.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my appreciation to all those who assisted in passage of the adult education amendment that is being acted on today as part of H.R. 678.

This amendment is vitally important to the people of my district in the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as the people of the other insular areas, who rely heavily on adult education programs to improve themselves and advance in life. Without this legislative correction we are enacting today, these people would have been hurt by an inadvertent cut in adult education funding.

Thanks to the timely passage of this amendment, the government of the Virgin Islands and other insular areas will retain the same basic level of adult education funding that they have received in past years, so they can continue to provide these important services to people who are striving to learn and improve themselves.

I want to extend special thanks to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who responded to my request for help to restore this funding. As always, the chairman took pains to be sure that the people of the insular areas have equitable access to educational programs. I also want to thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Montana, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Missouri, for their effort in handling this bill on the floor.

In the other body, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Utah, of the full Labor and Human Services Committee, and the gentleman from

Rhode Island and the gentlewoman from Kansas, of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, for their valuable cooperation in moving this amendment through their proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, I want briefly to reiterate how important this program is to the Virgin Islands, where more than 2,600 students are enrolled in adult education classes. The Virgin Islands commissioner of education, Dr. Linda Creque, and adult education director, Mrs. Anna Lewis, have done an excellent job of expanding this program and offering new adult education opportunities to an ever wider audience in our community.

These classes offer a second chance for adults who did not or could not get their high school degrees at a younger age. But now, with greater maturity, they are determined to learn and get their degree and get a better job to provide for themselves and their families. These students are some of the most determined and enthused people you can find in any classroom around this country. It gives me great pleasure to know that, thanks to this amendment we are passing today, they will be able to continue to study and advance in life.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Montana.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate amendment just concurred in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1989, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7, APPLIED TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1989

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight, Friday, April 28, 1989, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 7, the Applied Technology Education Amendments of 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1486, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1990

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 101-40) on the resolution (H. Res. 138) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1486) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2072, DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND TRANSFERS, URGENT SUPPLEMENTALS, AND CORRECTING ENROLLMENT ERRORS ACT OF 1989

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 135 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 135

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of bill (H.R. 2072) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers, urgent supplementals, and correcting enrollment errors for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344, as amended by Public Law 99-177) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During the consideration of the bill, all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 and 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived, except against the provisions beginning on page 20, line 19 through page 21, line 6; beginning on page 31, lines 5 through 12; and beginning on page 34, lines 19 through 25. It shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, said amendments shall be considered in the order specified in the report, may be offered only by the Member specified or his designee, shall be considered as having been read, shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour each, equally divided and controlled by the offeror and a Member opposed thereto, and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against

said amendments are hereby waived, except for points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI against provisions identical to those provisions in the bill against which points of order were not waived by this resolution. Any such point of order may lie only against those specified portions of an amendment, and not against an entire amendment. If both of said amendments are adopted, only the latter amendment which is adopted shall be considered to have been finally adopted and reported back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 135 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2072, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the rule waives points of order under two specified sections of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill, section 302(f) and section 311(a).

Section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act prohibits consideration of measures that would exceed the subcommittee allocations of new discretionary budget authority made pursuant to section 302(b) of the Budget Act. Since the bill provides new budget authority in excess of the Appropriations Committees 302(b) allocations the bill would violate section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, the second budget act waiver against consideration of the bill is section 311(a). Section 311(a) of the Budget Act prohibits consideration of any measure which would cause the budget authority or outlay ceilings established by the concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year to be breached. Since the budget authority and outlays set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 268, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1989, have already been exceeded, the bill would violate section 311(a) by causing the spending ceilings to be further exceeded.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee was reluctant to waive the Budget Act on this bill. However, the rule makes in order two amendments that will reduce spending to the levels that the President requested in the budget summit. In order for the House to be able to vote on these amendments the Rules Committee granted the Budget Act waivers to allow for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also waives clause 2 and 6 of rule 21, against the

bill, except for certain provisions. Clause 2, of rule 21, prohibits the inclusion of legislation and unauthorized appropriations in any appropriation bill.

There are three provisions that are subject to points of order. The first two provisions deal with adjusting pay rates for certain health care occupations within the Defense and Veterans Departments, and a provision that directs the Federal Aviation Administration to initiate rule making procedures to require airlines to use a particular type of explosive detection equipment.

These sections Mr. Speaker, were left unprotected at the request of the committees that have legislative jurisdiction on these matters.

Clause 6 of rule 21 prohibits reapropriations in a general appropriations bill, because the bill contains transfers of previously appropriated funds the waiver is necessary.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order two amendments that are printed in the report accompanying this resolution. The amendments are to be offered by the member named or his designee, and only in the order specified in the report.

They are, first, an amendment offered by Representative CONTE of Massachusetts, debatable for 1 hour, and, second, an amendment offered by Representative FOLEY of Washington, also debatable for 1 hour.

The Conte amendment contains a 0.67-percent cut of only nondefense items, eliminates homeless funding, and reduces drug interdiction money to \$370 million.

The Foley amendment will cut all discretionary spending that is not in this supplemental bill by a total of 0.57 percent across the board.

The amendments are not subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the Foley amendment and all points of order against the Conte amendment, except against specified sections of the Conte amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if both amendments are adopted, only the last amendment adopted in the committee will be considered as having been finally adopted and reported back to the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2072 makes available additional funding for the remainder of the 1989 fiscal year to Government programs and agencies that are in danger of running out of money. The programs that would be directly funded from this bill vary from fighting the drug epidemic, providing decent assistance to the Nation's homeless, continuing medical care for our Nation's veterans, to the funding for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

The leadership on both sides of the aisle as well as the leadership of the

House Budget and Appropriations Committee are to be commended for their bipartisanship cooperation that allows for this much needed bill to be brought before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has ably described the provisions of the rule, but I would like to point out to the Members that when the Committee on Rules heard this measure yesterday, I offered a motion to send the bill back to the Committee on Appropriations, for further consideration in order to iron out the controversies in the bill.

□ 1110

I was voted down.

Mr. Speaker, this measure does have a considerable problem as it was finally reported by the Appropriations Committee. A lot of extra spending was loaded on which was not necessary to respond to real emergencies.

In some instances money which was budgeted for fiscal year 1990 was included in this bill so as to give more leeway for extra spending in 1990. It is this extra spending which makes this bill controversial, Mr. Speaker.

In the Rules Committee I offered a motion, as I said, to send the bill back to the Appropriations Committee, but that was turned down. Instead we have ended up with a rule which provides for the consideration of two major substitutes. The first is a proposal by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]. The Conte amendment takes the responsible approach of cutting out unnecessary spending while preserving spending for programs where the need is real, such as veterans health care.

The other amendment is to be offered by the majority leader, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY]. The problem with the Foley amendment, Mr. Speaker, is that it will make cuts in defense programs which will then be used to fund domestic programs, most of which are not in need of "dire emergency" supplemental appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the best solution at this point is to defeat this rule so that the Appropriations Committee can go back and take out the unnecessary extra spending which has been tacked onto the bill. We could then move quickly on a bill to provide funding for those areas where there is a real emergency, like veterans health care.

The administration has sent up their views on the Foley amendment, and they oppose it. If the Conte substitute passes, they will support it. Neither of

the substitutes changes what has been proposed for the Veterans' Administration.

I have a VA hospital in my district, and I know some of the beds badly need to be occupied by veterans, but the Veterans' Administration does not have the funds with which to operate all the functions of the hospital. That is true throughout the country. The veterans of this country have served their country well and honorably and they deserve the funds in this emergency appropriation bill. Both substitutes provide those funds.

But irrespective of the emergency for the Veterans' Administration, which must be corrected without any further delay, there are other problems affecting this Nation of ours. The bill violates the agreement on the budget reached in a bipartisan fashion. I think when we have negotiated and both sides of the aisle have agreed, along with the administration, on this proposal, then that agreement should be lived up to and not violated. That is the situation we are in today.

As I recommended in the Rules Committee, the bill should have gone back to the Appropriations Committee. I have faith in the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I know that he would have come out with another measure conforming to the bipartisan agreement reached on both sides of the aisle.

So today I would recommend highly that we defeat this rule so it can go back to the committee, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], our minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, and urge its rejection.

This is obviously not the first time the Rules Committee has granted a waiver to an appropriations bill that exceeds the budget resolution parameters. In fact, the committee has been making a practice of granting such waivers in recent years, which explains in part why the deficit is still where it is.

What is particularly onerous about this one, however, is that it applies to the first appropriations bill out of the box this year, and it specifically contradicts what was agreed to in the budget summit 2 years ago. In that summit, we agreed that there should be no supplementals except those providing for dire emergencies.

It is blatantly false for the Appropriations Committee to claim that the entire \$4.9 billion in this supplemental represents "dire emergency" money. And it further stretches the truth for the Rules Committee to in essence buy that claim by granting this waiver.

Of course, the committee tells us that the waiver is justified because floor amendments will be offered off-

setting a portion of the spending increases in the bill. This misses the point. First of all, we have no assurances any of those offset amendments will pass.

Second, this lets the Appropriations Committee off the hook. If the budget process is to mean anything, we must demand that the committees of this House adhere to the letter of the law. The 1987 budget summit agreement, as written into law, demands no tampering with those figures we agreed upon.

That was what those closed door arguments were all about.

Admittedly our big hangup at the time was over the defense figure. We argued for several days over one-half billion dollars.

Now in addition to the tremendous cuts that Secretary Cheney has to contend with in this next year's Defense budget, the Democratic majority want him to take another \$1.7 billion hit by way of the across-the-board cuts as off-sets to their insatiable appetite to up the ante in this first appropriation bill to come before the House in this Congress.

If the Appropriations Committee cannot follow the law, we should deny floor consideration of their product until they do.

The floor amendment proposed by the majority is a violation of the budget summit agreement. That agreement was very specific in the division of spending between defense and domestic discretionary. This was painstakingly arrived at and was at the core of the agreement.

The majority amendment represents an out and out violation of that agreement by taking most of its offsets out of defense to fund higher domestic expenditures. So much for budget summit agreements. If that same standard is going to apply to the fiscal year 1990 budget agreement just reached a couple of weeks ago, then we probably have an agreement that isn't worth the paper it's written on.

I hope that's not going to be the case, and I hope the majority plans to stick to their commitments. But when we see, through this amendment, how they play fast and loose with the commitment of 2 years ago, I cannot feel very confident. And that in itself is very disappointing.

Mr. Speaker, the only effective way to deal with this bill is to send it back to the Appropriations Committee by defeating this rule and ask the committee to send back a bill with only the urgent items, such as the veterans health and disability benefits and the money for the deficiency in the fire fighters account spent during last year's devastating fires out West.

I urge defeat of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a letter from Secretary Cheney

outlining some of the problems with this supplemental appropriation bill.

The letter referred to follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 26, 1989.

Hon. BOB MICHEL,
Republican Leader of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: It has come to my attention that the Democratic leadership proposes to fund the supplemental for Fiscal Year 1989 by imposing a reduction of \$1.7 billion on the defense budget for the current fiscal year. If such a measure passes, I will recommend to the President that he veto the Supplemental Appropriations Bill.

Attached is a memo explaining in some detail the impact of the proposed reduction. .57% sounds like a small number until you realize that we are in the final four months of the fiscal year and that it can only come out of certain accounts. The reduction would fall most severely on personnel O and M accounts, and research and development, where there is very little flexibility this late in the fiscal year.

In putting together the President's DoD budget proposal for FY 1990, I have been very careful to avoid cuts which would interfere with our ability to recruit and retain first-class people for the nation's armed forces. This proposal would do enormous damage before we even get to FY 90.

The cuts would force me to freeze permanent change of station moves disrupting plans of military families. I would have to stop payment of reenlistment bonuses which would seriously reduce our ability to obtain trained and skilled people, and I would have to provide for the early release of some 28,000 people scheduled to leave the service between now and the end of the fiscal year. This would have very serious consequences for the manning of our forces.

I am also deeply disturbed as a former Member of the House of Representatives at the prospect that commitments made by the Congress in the fall of 1987 concerning funding measures for defense in FY 89 will not be kept. If we are to have a period of greater consultation and cooperation between the President and the Congress on matters of national security policy in the years ahead, I believe it is essential that Congress live up to its commitments.

I hope that this unwise proposal will be defeated. If it is not, I will urge the President in the strongest possible terms to veto the measure when it reaches his desk.

Best regards,

DICK CHENEY.

AMENDMENT PROVIDING ACROSS-THE-BOARD CUTS IMPACT ON DEFENSE

The proposed amendment to reduce FY 1989 accounts by .57 percent would have the following impact on DoD:

Reduce Defense funding by \$1.7 billion, including the following Budget Title reductions:

	[In millions of dollars]
Military personnel.....	-448
Operation and maintenance	-490
Procurement.....	-452
Research and development.....	-214
Military construction/family housing	-50
Total	-1,654

The Defense budget base already weakened by 4 years of negative real growth

would be further damaged by the impact of another \$1.7 billion of reduction in FY 1989.

Negative real growth in FY 1989 would increase from -1.3% to -1.8%.

Reductions would fall severely on Military Personnel, Operation and Maintenance and Research & Development appropriations where there is little flexibility to absorb reductions late in the fiscal year.

Reserve/Guard programs would be hard hit—almost 25% of school/special/mobilization training would be eliminated. Direct negative impact on readiness. Foregone training is that which would be used to develop skills for integration of reserve forces with the active force. Degrades the ability of reserves to fulfill missions.

Freeze PCS moves. Disrupts the proper staffing of critical positions as well as family plans such as movement to new schools and selection of new homes. Serious morale problem. Direct impact on retention.

Stop payment of reenlistment bonuses. Service lose significant number of key personnel. Will take years to replace loss of core technical/leader personnel in critical skills.

Early release all people scheduled to leave the Service through the end of the fiscal year (about 28,000 personnel). Causes serious undermanning of force and immediate adverse impact on readiness.

Would cause a reduction in Army ground operating tempos and ship steaming and flying hours needed to maintain training proficiency.

Reductions in real property maintenance and depot maintenance would have to be made in order to avoid personnel reductions.

Five to ten Military Construction projects would be eliminated and planned maintenance of family housing units would have to be curtailed. Morale would be adversely affected and operating costs would not be reduced.

Since two thirds of the year is gone, the reduction in RDT&E would have to be taken in technology and research programs at the laboratories and universities and by curtailing planned testing of weapons systems.

Scientists and engineers would be laid off until FY 1990 funds are available. With the highly competitive environment that exists in the technology field, it is likely that many people would not return. Programs could suffer long term negative impact.

Training equipment, support equipment, spare parts and logistic for major weapons systems would be cut back seriously impacting readiness.

Disrupt ongoing contract negotiations as procurement requests are withdrawn to accommodate lower dollar levels.

Communications equipment, munitions and special support equipment would be deleted. Adverse impact on readiness and sustainability.

□ 1120

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My friends, you know our friend from Illinois, the minority leader, has a very convenient memory. Just 2 weeks ago we passed an appropriations bill providing \$66 million for the Contras and he spoke for it. So that was

the first appropriation bill of the session.

It is when we look after our own country that we hear so much opposition. That bill passed without any problem, \$66 million to the Contras. That was the first appropriation bill this Congress.

He talked about what would be cut by the Foley amendment. Let us see what would be left for military spending. We would have \$297 billion left for military spending if the Foley amendment is adopted. I do not know whether it will be or not.

Not only that but the estimates of DOD are that there will be unobligated balances of \$41.2 billion at the end of this fiscal year, and unexpended balances would be \$259 billion.

I have not supported similar provision as of now. But we have got to get this bill to the Senate. This is not a law, it is a bill. We have got to get to the Senate. We have to pass this bill in order to get to conference. Unless we pass this bill, none of the funds provided in this bill will become available.

Let me say this: I am proud of our Committee on Appropriations. We have held appropriation bills below the budget. Since 1945 we have cut \$187 billion below the recommendations of the Presidents. Under President Reagan we have cut \$16.1 billion below the budget. It is not your Committee on Appropriations that has brought about this situation.

Let me tell you about the bill that we have here.

I know most of us like things in this bill that we think are important.

We do have in this bill—listen to this now—we have in this bill the urgent supplemental, and everybody is talking about the great amount of money in here for drugs. Let me tell you what this is. It is available until expended which means it will be spent by agreement between the executive branch and the congressional branch. What more can you do to give us some control and some say about it?

We have some other things that are vital to the American people. What did we do? We cut back other expenditures solely so that we could include this. Then we have one thing, may I say, that is vital to us too.

Now I have been to conferences with the Senate, and they average about 300 amendments for supplementals. The provision in here which makes funds available subject only to raising the money in advance in addition to what we have, it never becomes available for obligation or expenditure. But I will tell you you will be begging us in our conference with the Senate to protect your interests. We put it in here to get it to conference.

May I repeat again: My friend from Tennessee says that we do not want a delay. If you vote this rule down you

have got delay. You have brought it on yourself. Everybody here has three or four things that they put higher priority than others do. But when you have 435 Members and put them together we have done a great job, if I may say so.

Let me repeat again to all of you: Our Committee on Appropriations since 1945 has held the appropriation bills \$187 billion below the Presidents' recommendations. Under the Reagan administration we held it \$16 billion under.

It is going around our committee with entitlements and other back-door spending that has created the deficit problem.

I will tell you something else: The rules provide that when you make a mistake you can waive the requirement in order to correct that mistake, and that is what we have here. I have heard enough about the summit business. I was on the committee. I know what was agreed to down at the White House. Since then, all anyone has is ideas and interpretations because it is not in writing. But whatever it was the rules permit you to say that when you make a mistake or situations do change, you can correct the mistake or accommodate the situation. Again if you do not adopt this rule you have held up all these appropriations.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to this bill. Indeed, I would be opposed to granting this bill any rule at all in its present form. H.R. 2072 should be sent back to the Appropriations Committee, where it should stay until the members of that committee can agree among themselves to come up with a reputable bill which can command bipartisan support.

By granting this bill a rule, we are continuing to say to the financial markets and to everyone else in our country that this Congress couldn't make a tough decision to save its life. Here we are, right back to business as usual.

If the rule goes through, and we consider this bill in its present form, the House will find itself looking at what is essentially a political document. This bill represents a massive, politically motivated add-on to what started out as a very rudimentary and responsible supplemental request from the administration. Once again, it's Christmas in April! And the Appropriations Committee has produced a Christmas tree bill.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if it were not 65 or 70 degrees outside right now I would suggest the Members of the House join in singing a lusty rendition of "Deck the Halls." And may I say that decking the halls would be a more

constructive enterprise than wrecking the latest budget summit agreement—which is exactly what passage of H.R. 2072 will accomplish.

Before the bill ever saw the light of day, spending in fiscal year 1989 was already exceeding the ceilings on both budget authority and outlays by nearly \$1 billion. And this bill adds at least another \$2.7 billion in spending authority to this already-deteriorating budget scenario. Every agreement—or law—to which Congress has committed itself has been violated. The 1987 budget summit agreement, the fiscal year 1989 budget resolution, and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

H.R. 2072 has the additional feature of front-loading a lot of 1990 money into 1989—which makes it all the easier to load up on additional 1990 spending a year from now, or whenever the next "dire emergency" hits. If the bipartisan budget summit agreement reached last week isn't killed off by this bill altogether, clearly that agreement will be rendered comatose.

But what else can we expect when a senior member of the Appropriations Committee comes before the Rules Committee and candidly admits that all the budget summit agreement amounts to is a couple of Members running down to the White House to have their pictures taken? If that view is reflective of the one held by his fellow subcommittee chairmen on appropriations, it is no wonder the committee is out of control.

H.R. 2072 in its present form is so irresponsible that a poll of members of the Budget Committee revealed an overwhelming majority of them to be opposed to granting any waivers of the Budget Act. The rule would allow for those waivers—that's reason enough right there to defeat this rule. But, of course, the fall-back position is that the amendments to be offered by Mr. CONTE and Mr. FOLEY contain offsetting, across-the-board budget reductions. So, who is worried about waivers?

Mr. Speaker, I would just continue by making two last points. First, April 15 has come and gone for another year. Congress has missed its deadline again for passing a budget resolution. We were so busy decorating a Christmas tree we violated the law. Maybe we can pass a budget resolution before Arbor Day. Then again, maybe not.

Second, I would underscore the political nature of H.R. 2072 by focusing for a moment on the benefit package it has for veterans. Everybody knows a supplemental request from the administration for our veterans will be coming very shortly. But, in order to make this bill more palatable, veterans' benefits were placed in it—held hostage, in other words—in the hope that such popular and necessary programs would attract the votes required to pass the rest of this package.

But I say enough is enough! Let's quit playing with the lives and livelihoods of people and start doing the right thing. If H.R. 2072 passes, we may as well unfurl a flag from the top of the dome which says Congress is back in session; the buck passes here; it's business as usual; and if you're looking for solutions to the problems of our country, keep right on looking—because the Congress has no answers.

□ 1130

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I do so because it gives the House an opportunity to provide additional funding for critical programs while paying for discretionary spending that exceeds the limits set in the budget resolution. The pay-as-you-go approach embodied in this rule is one that protects the integrity of the budget process and demonstrates the ability of this body to exercise budget discipline.

The supplemental bill, as reported from the Appropriations Committee, violates the Budget Act by providing discretionary spending in fiscal year 1989 in excess of the spending ceilings set forth in the budget resolution. Specifically, the bill violates section 302(f)(1) of the Budget Act by providing spending in excess of the committee's appropriate subcommittee section 302(b) allocations. Also, since the overall budget authority and outlay ceilings for fiscal year 1989 have already been exceeded and since the Appropriations Committee has exceeded its 302(a) allocation of total discretionary spending, the reported bill violates section 311(a) by causing the ceilings to be further exceeded. The current level of budget authority is over the ceiling by \$934 million and the current level of outlays exceeds the ceiling by \$391 million.

Additionally, CBO estimates that \$462 million in outlays will spill over into fiscal year 1990 as a result of this supplemental.

Title I of the bill provides mandatory supplementals of \$2.288 billion in budget authority for fiscal year 1989. The additional funding for mandatory programs does not raise any Budget Act issues since full funding of mandatory programs was assumed in the fiscal year 1989 budget resolution.

The bill provides total discretionary spending of \$2.718 billion in budget authority for fiscal year 1989. CBO estimates that the bill results in \$1.443 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1989. Discretionary programs funded in titles I and II of the bill include FAA, refugee assistance, veterans medical care, farm income stabilization, emergency drug funding, homeless programs, peacekeeping activities, Japanese-American reparation payments,

NOAA operations, agricultural credit insurance fund, and other programs.

I recognize that many of the programs in the supplemental bill require additional funding to prevent a disruption in services or benefits. I also recognize that most of this funding is intended to meet critical needs in our society.

However, the reported bill raises serious questions about the willingness or ability of the House to adhere to budgets and to budget agreements with the White House. The bill not only provides for spending beyond the levels set in the budget resolution but also challenges the provision of the 1987 summit agreement between Congress and the White House which specifically ruled out supplementals except for dire emergencies.

As my colleagues know, the bipartisan leadership of the House and Senate have reached a new budget agreement with the White House for fiscal year 1990. Frankly, if we do not adhere to the 1987 agreement, and if we take action that actually causes additional spending in fiscal year 1990, it will cause considerable doubt about the implementation of this agreement.

We have an uphill road to travel if we are going to make serious reductions in the deficit and meet the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction targets. If we cannot stick to the budgets we enact and to agreements reached in good faith, it becomes that much more difficult to reach those targets.

The amendment by the majority leader made in order by the rule addresses these concerns. The amendment would reduce by approximately one-half of 1 percent all discretionary accounts across the board, except those in the supplemental. It is fair, it is simple, and it provides a pay-as-you-go approach that I believe makes sense.

If we are going to spend new money, we have to pay for it. The leadership amendment does that. I hope my colleagues will support this rule, and I hope they will support the majority leader's amendment later today.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule to grant a waiver of the Budget Act for consideration of H.R. 2072.

Mr. Speaker, if a satirist wanted the perfect lampoon about how the Congress of the United States makes economic policy, if a cartoonist was looking for the biggest blubbering whale in the ocean to harpoon, if they wanted a model for a real turkey they would need look no further than the spectacle which is about to unfold today.

We have, on many occasions, in the recent past, made statements, signed agreements, taken oaths, promised

and pledged to our constituents, our voters, that we would do our utmost to bring the Federal deficit under control.

Well, on April 26, 1989, at a time when we have breached every spending target we set, from the Budget Summit Agreement of 1987, to the budget resolution for fiscal year 1989, to Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, we bring our first major appropriations bill to the House floor this year.

At a time when we are celebrating the genius of our First Congress 200 years ago, when we are seeking to emulate their courage and leadership, when the future of our economy hangs in the balance, what is our first act of courage, our first signal of fiscal responsibility that we send as a beacon to the free world?

Here it is in this rule. We want to waive any provision of law that keeps us from spending more money and we want a waiver of the Budget Act to do it. A little more money? No! A lot more money; \$5 billion more money. More than double the administration request. A 400-percent increase in discretionary "controllable" spending.

Mr. Speaker, within a week the House budget resolution for fiscal year 1990 is expected on the floor, containing an agreement to reduce the deficit by \$70 billion. How in the world can we take up that agreement with a straight face knowing full well we have just voted to waive our last agreement? Who is going to believe us on the new agreement, when our first act of spending restraint in this Congress is to find a way to breach yet once again our last agreement?

In that last agreement, we vowed to propose supplementals only in the case of dire emergency, a promise that is restated in the recent budget agreement for 1990. And there are dire emergencies in this bill—medical care for our veterans for one.

But we don't stop with real emergencies in this bill. In antidrug programs, homelessness, and the internment funds, the bill takes hundreds of millions of dollars that are proposed to be spent in fiscal year 1990 and sticks them in this bill. It is being used as a gimmick to stuff 1990 money into 1989 so that there's room to spend even more in 1990.

Full funding for the homeless is coming in a month in the regular HUD bill. A billion increase for drugs is part of the administration request for 1990. But we just can't exercise one month's worth of restraint in shoveling this money out there.

So now, having created this mess, we've got to try to bail ourselves out. And that is what the comic opera planned for today is all about. So there will be the Conte plan and the Foley plan, neither one of them perfect, trying to clean our shoes after we've already stepped in it.

And after the script plays out, where will we be? Will we have a bill that the President will sign? I'll put money against it. Will the veterans be any closer to getting their medical care? Just you wait and see.

There is one way to avoid the mess. Don't step in it. There is too much unnecessary spending in here to offset, and even if you offset, it will cause pain and problems in the programs tapped for the money. The underlying bill is too large, too expensive, and too out of touch with fiscal reality.

The right thing to do is to send this bill back to committee. You shouldn't have to clean up their mess. Speak for fiscal responsibility. Speak for leadership and courage. But above all speak for yourself.

Don't let your first vote on fiscal policy in the 101st Congress be a vote to waive spending limits in the Budget Act. Your past resolve, and your future credibility to control spending and to limit the deficit are at stake.

This is a reality check, folks. This is not the fiscal policy of Brazil; we're deciding here. Though it may seem like it today, this is not a night at the opera or even a day at the races. This is one that will set the course for the rest of this Congress. Don't take up the bill until the committee gets it right. Vote the rule down.

□ 1140

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] on the effort he made in the Appropriations Committee to pare this down to reasonable proportions, to a point where certainly it would have passed muster in the White House.

Admittedly, the gentleman's reputation over the years in this House has been as a moderate voice, one who has had compassion for those who need it, and certainly rallying in time of need for those who are in distress. I think what the gentleman said to us today, coming from that quarter, is something we ought to be listening to. He has been on the committee now for nearly 30 years and recognizes what is a valid expenditure, what is really an urgent expenditure and what is not.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to applaud the gentleman and compliment him for the effort he made. Although the amendment he offered in committee went down on a straight party line vote, he was on the right side of the issue, and I want to compliment him for it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my leader for those kind words.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], a member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone here can wade through what we have been hearing this morning without stepping in it, they are indeed agile. Let me point out a few things.

All of these bills, the administration's bill, the Conte bill, and the bill we have before us, add to the deficit for mandatory spending. That is true of all of them. The gentleman does not even mention that. Only the bill with the Foley amendment completely offsets the additional discretionary spending in the bill. So what we have been hearing is mostly a lot of pettifoggery.

The real question here is: What are the priorities of this country in a mid-year revision? We have had midyear revisions on appropriations bills in the past, and that is what we have here today.

Back when we had plenty of money or when we thought we did, we would come up to a midyear revision, and we would call it a supplemental and we would let the agencies keep what they had, even if they had too much, and if we needed to add some to some agency, we just added it on. Now we are in a tight budget situation, and we are looking for ways to offset, to take from those agencies in the middle of the year that have a little more than what they need and give it to other agencies. There has got to be a mechanism for doing that. That is what this supplemental is all about. Everybody is in agreement that that is what we need to do.

The administration sent up a bill that only took from those accounts that were not poor to start with. We need their help to find where the offsets are.

The administration said that they would want \$125 million for international affairs, and they said, "Oh, yes, we can find that in defense and we can just transfer the money." They did that in a hurry because they wanted it. What we want to do here is get this bill out of the House and over to the Senate. One way or another, by the time we get it out of the House, hopefully there will be an agreement to offset some of the items here so we will have a bill that is more agreeable to both the administration and the Congress.

Let me mention the things that the administration left out of its bill that we think ought to be in.

First of all, the administration did not request all of the funds that the committee believes are necessary to maintain the 194,000 FTE's currently

in the 172 VA hospitals. So we added \$37 million for this purpose.

Second, the administration did not request any additional funds for the war on drugs. We just passed a drug bill last fall. We stayed here 3 extra weeks so we could pass a drug bill. Everybody came down on the floor and said, "What a great bill that is." Only 11 Members voted against it. The President signed it and said it was a great bill. He was all for it.

Now comes the time to fully fund that bill. If the administration does not want to fund it, and they do not think that is a high priority and there is no place in the trillion-dollar government where we can find that kind of money, then we can vote for the Conte amendment or we can vote to strike the drug part of the bill. That is our privilege.

On the other hand, there is the bill which authorizes compensation for those Japanese-Americans who were placed in relocation camps during World War II merely because of their race. It was passed here overwhelmingly. President Bush went out to California and said, "I am all for it, 100 percent"—not 90 percent, not 80 percent, not 50 percent, but 100 percent. The committee put \$250 million in the bill for that program, although the Justice Department asked OMB for \$500 million for fiscal year 1989 to get started on this program. So we have half as much as the Justice Department thought was necessary this year.

Then there is the homeless bill. Everybody votes for it, everybody talks about it back home, but when it comes time to fund it, they do not want to fund it.

So that is what we are talking about. We are in a midyear revision, and the way we want to revise the budget is the way it is in our bill. We will find offsets by the time it gets out of conference if the administration will help us, and the one way to get them to help us in good faith is to include defense along with other things where we are going to have a 0.57-percent cut. It was said up here that this violates some agreement we had back in 1987. To start with, there was not any agreement, but even if there was, does anybody believe we can tell within 0.57 percent what the Defense Department is going to need 2 years later? Of course not.

The reason the amount of the cut for defense is so big is because the total amount for defense is so big. It is \$300 billion. That is all we are talking about, a revision of 0.57 percent, so we can cover some of the higher priorities in the Congress that I think are necessary instead of leaving them unfunded for the rest of the year.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the bill as presented to us from the Appropriations Committee is the moral equivalent of banana republic fiscal policy. The bill violates not only the agreement of 1987 but it violates our own budget resolution of last year, and clearly it represents a profligacy of the worst order. Not only are we spending on nonemergency items, we are actually spending 1990 items, which to the casual observer would seem to be in the bill only to relieve the Appropriations Committee from distress and have nothing to do with an emergency situation.

Be that as it may, the rule should be defeated, it is a bad appropriations bill. Fixing it up with amendments of any kind is probably not the way we should go. Looking at the amendments, the Conte amendment, as a compromise, does not cover all the offsets and, therefore, violates at least the fiscal aspects of the summit agreement and the resolution. The Foley amendment, which is sounder fiscally, also violates the 1987 summit agreement and the budget resolution because the defense numbers, particularly VA, were supposed to be ceilings as floors, as well as floors, and so were the international amounts.

The ideal situation is to go back to the President's submission to the Appropriations Committee which offset everything and fulfills all of the obligations of the summit agreement and the provisions of the budget resolution of the last fiscal year.

□ 1150

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the motion to recommit should go back to the President's submission, and that is the right thing, no extraneous spending, no nonemergency spending, no 1990 spending, no violating the military aspects or the fiscal aspects of the agreement.

Vote against the rule and for the motion to recommit.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my favorite philosopher is Archie the Cockroach, and Archie observed once, "Did you ever notice when a politician gets an idea he gets it all wrong?"

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that Archie had to have in mind the last three Republican speakers when he made that observation, and let me tell you why.

First of all, we hear this baloney peddled on that side of the aisle that somehow the Foley amendment violates the summit. Absolute nonsense. If my colleagues will take a look at the numbers, they will see that we promised, when that summit was adopted 2 years ago, that the outlay number for defense for 1990 was going to be \$294 billion. The President's budget for the

coming year told Congress that the administration was now going to be spending on the outlay side for defense in this fiscal year not \$294 billion, but \$298.3 billion.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if anybody is in violation of the summit, it is the administration on that defense number.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield until I am finished.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. You're welcome.

Mr. Speaker, the second point that I would like to make is that with the Foley amendment, which reduces that excess spending on the outlay side by \$1.2 billion for defense, we are still, we are still \$3 billion above the amount on the outlay side that the administration promised we would be spending for defense in this fiscal year.

So, let us not have any holy picture stances over there about who is violating the summit on the defense side because clearly they are.

The second thing I would suggest, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield until I am finished. I will not yield. I will ask the Chair to keep order on that point.

Mr. Speaker, the second point I would make is that, if we are going to talk about fealty to the spirit of Gramm-Rudman, we ought to be embarrassed to support that savings and loan turkey which the administration is recommending to the Congress. That is going to cost the taxpayers \$4.5 billion more than it should cost in order to maintain a bookkeeping fiction. A \$4.5 billion price tag is too high a price to pay for the fact that politicians do not have guts enough to admit the costs of their own actions.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] refuses to yield. The gentleman has the floor. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous that we would stick the taxpayer with a \$4.5 billion add-on in costs for that bill because politicians do not have the guts to admit the cost of their own actions.

Third, Mr. Speaker, we are told on the Republican side of the aisle that we cannot afford to absorb a half a percent cut on the Defense budget to pay for these items. I did not see the administration crying over the floor when they were proposing twice that cut on the domestic side because the

administration wanted to finance its goodies, but they wanted to finance them only by cutting on the domestic side. They wanted to exempt the Pentagon. Baloney.

The fourth thing I would point out is simply this, Mr. Speaker. It has been suggested that this is the first appropriation bill on the floor this year. Nonsense. The first appropriation bill on the floor this year was the Contra appropriation, and the administration did not want to fully pay for that out of defense in the first instance. We finally insisted on it.

They wanted us to vote for money for the Contras thousands of miles away. But, Mr. Speaker, they do not want us to meet our domestic responsibilities to the homeless. They do not want us to meet our responsibilities to fully fund the war against drugs.

Mr. Speaker, tell me what is the greater threat to an American family today: an invasion from the Russians or the threat they face from the drug warfare on our streets? We know the answer to that one. This bill is more responsible fiscally than the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts because it provides a spending offset for all discretionary spending, not just some of it. It meets its responsibility by asking all programs across the board to take the same amount of reduction rather than exempting the administration's pet, the Pentagon, which will still spend \$3 billion more than the summit said they would spend on the outlay side.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule which, in my opinion, represents one of the more pressing problems we in Congress face. This rule waives the Budget Act, waives House rules against unauthorized appropriations, and waives various other House rules. Now I realize that such waivers are not unheard of, but I do not think the Republic would fall if we did not waive the Budget Act for a bill which includes twice as much money as the administration requested and which has been termed a budget-buster by members from both sides of the aisle the on Budget Committee.

In fact, I would prefer that we never waive the Budget Act, because I believe that the American public is fed up with our disregard for the rules we make for ourselves. I strongly believe that we must draw a line of fiscal restraint at some point, and I think sending this bill back to the Appropriations Committee so that a more reasonable bill might be reported back is a step in that direction. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and to send this bill back to committee.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] for yielding this time to me.

My colleagues, I think that it is very important for us to understand why we are here today, why this supplemental is on the floor in the first place. One of the main reasons is this is a midcourse correction, as the gentleman from Iowa has so eloquently stated. This is a course correction that we do almost every year to determine exactly what our spending priorities and needs are at this point in time as against the money that we have allocated.

Second, and as importantly, we are here because the President's budget failed to include money for some of the most important programs that the United States has in its budget process. Those programs are veterans, veterans' money that was authorized by the Congress of the United States and voted on not only by the Democrats, but by the Republicans, almost \$1.2 billion worth not put in by the President. The war on drugs, that war that all of us in this Chamber have been talking about for years and funding for years, that has been given lip service only, or less, by succeeding administrations of Reagan and Bush, now has been put out in the open, refused funding, by the President of the United States.

The homeless fight; what we are talking about here is what the President himself on the campaign trail during the debate stood up and said, "I fully support the McKinney bill." We are putting the money in to fund this bill fully. This is the fight, right here on this floor, where the homeless will get what they are entitled to, what the President says he supported.

Finally, the Japanese-American reparations, which this House voted significantly to endorse and fund; it is a tragedy that this President chose not to fund that program.

This is what we are doing here, and with the Foley approach we will be doing it without adding any money other than what was either authorized or what ultimately does not cost a single penny in additional deficit for discretionary.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time so that I might respond to the distinguished, but unyielding, gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] whose attention I was not able to attract during the debate.

The 1987 summit and last year's budget resolution provided for \$299.5

billion in BA. The Committee on Appropriations appropriates budget authority. They appropriated \$298.8, within 700 million; not bad for government work I suggest. However, if my colleagues take into effect the Foley amendment, they will knock about \$1.8 billion out of that.

Now I did not say that it was bad policy necessarily to make an offset from military or directly from domestic. What I said was the Congress is repudiating the agreement that it swore to uphold, and, if we are not going to keep our word and if the Committee on Appropriations is going to tell us we should not keep our word, the world may as well know about it right now.

□ 1200

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by the debate on this rule, it is controversial. There is no question but what the honorable gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has tried hard to work out a compromise, but there has been no compromise.

The bill constitutes a violation of the bipartisan agreement that was reached both with the Members and with the administration, and if the Foley substitute should pass, the administration is opposed to that.

I would recommend that we defeat the rule. In the event that the rule is passed, I suggest that we vote on the motion to recommit and vote for that motion. If the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is voted upon, I would recommend support of that substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the majority leader, the honorable gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is whether it will approve this rule. I would ask the Members to consider what a rule is. It is a resolution providing for the terms of debate. Now, it is true that there are going to be issues of controversy when we consider the supplemental appropriations, but the rule fully provides for the House to resolve that controversy.

There is an amendment in order of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]. There is an amendment in order by me. There are opportunities for every Member of Congress to exercise their full rights with respect to any general appropriation bill, which includes motions to strike. If there are things in the supplemental that Members feel are inappropriate, move to strike them, and let the House decide.

If you prefer the Conte amendment to the Foley amendment, so-called, vote for the Conte amendment and try to defeat the Foley amendment. That is perfectly appropriate under the rules; but to defeat the rule is an untoward and destructive effort by those who oppose the rule to prevent the House from deciding this issue.

There are clearly, as everybody realizes, dire urgent supplemental requirements here in terms of taking care of the problems of our veterans and veterans' hospitals. There is a dire emergency. Everybody concedes that.

In terms of implementing the war on drugs, there is a dire emergency, and many others, including problems of law enforcement and other key areas in our economy and National Government.

So I would urge Members to look at this issue, and first of all a vote for the rule is a vote to let the House decide these issues, and on the question whether this bill or my amendment provides any sort of mechanism to breach the 1987 summit agreement, there are many in this House who participated in that summit agreement. I would certainly recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTEL], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and others who were participants. I was a participant. I had the honor of being the chairman of that effort. I can assure the Members that in my opinion the amendment does not breach any of those agreements.

The 1987 reconciliation bill, Public Law 100-203, set military spending at \$294 billion. The fiscal year 1990 budget shows 1989 military spending at \$298,255,000,000, an increase of \$4.255 billion.

Even if the Foley amendment is adopted, the resulting appropriation will be well within the summit agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter that I think is very important that has not been alluded to much in the debate that is included in the supplemental. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests, Family Farms, and Energy of the Committee on Agriculture, I am quite serious about and I think we need very much is the fact that there is almost no money in the Forest Service at the present time to fight forest fires, and we are getting near the season for fires.

Mr. FOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. There are urgent emergency needs here. Let us let the House decide this. Let us bring this bill before the House. Support the rule.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I do so reluctantly, yet I must because it authorizes us to take up a supplemental appropriations bill that violates the November 1987 summit agreement.

I believe that such summit agreements between the executive and legislative branches are very useful. They enable us to demonstrate to the world's financial markets that we do indeed have a plan to eliminate our budget deficits. They enable us to perform our appropriations work in a timely fashion. But they will work only so long as we honor them. Once it becomes clear that the Democratic leadership will enter into a summit agreement one day and violate it on a subsequent day, the useful device is destroyed. The appropriations proposed by the Democratic leadership are for worthy causes for which I am supportive, yet collectively they violate the aforementioned agreement.

If we wish to preserve the summit process, we must vote "no" on the rule. I believe that that is in the national interest.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 198, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—223

Ackerman	DeFazio	Guarini
Akaka	Dellums	Hall (TX)
Alexander	Derrick	Harris
Anderson	Dicks	Hatcher
Andrews	Dingell	Hawkins
Anthony	Dixon	Hayes (IL)
Applegate	Donnelly	Hayes (LA)
Atkins	Dorgan (ND)	Hefner
AuCoin	Downey	Hertel
Barnard	Durbin	Hoagland
Beilenson	Dwyer	Hochbrueckner
Berman	Dymally	Hoyer
Bevill	Dyson	Hughes
Bilbray	Early	Jenkins
Boggs	Eckart	Johnson (SD)
Bonior	Edwards (CA)	Johnston
Borski	Engel	Jones (GA)
Bosco	Erdreich	Jones (NC)
Boucher	Espy	Jontz
Boxer	Evans	Kanjorski
Brennan	Fascell	Kastenmeier
Brooks	Fazio	Kennedy
Browder	Feighan	Kennelly
Brown (CA)	Flake	Kildee
Bruce	Flippo	Kleczka
Bryant	Florrio	Kolter
Bustamante	Foglietta	Kostmayer
Campbell (CO)	Foley	LaFalce
Cardin	Ford (MI)	Lancaster
Carper	Ford (TN)	Lantos
Carr	Frank	Laughlin
Chapman	Frost	Leath (TX)
Clarke	Garcia	Lehman (CA)
Clement	Gaydos	Lehman (FL)
Coelho	Gedjenson	Leland
Coleman (TX)	Gephardt	Levin (MI)
Conyers	Gibbons	Levine (CA)
Costello	Glickman	Lewis (GA)
Coyne	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Crockett	Gordon	Long
de la Garza	Gray	

Lowey (NY)	Owens (NY)	Solarz
Lukens, Thomas	Owens (UT)	Staggers
Manton	Pallone	Stallings
Markey	Panetta	Stark
Martin (NY)	Patterson	Stokes
Martinez	Payne (NJ)	Studds
Matsui	Payne (VA)	Swift
Mavroules	Pease	Synar
Mazzoli	Pelosi	Tanner
McCloskey	Perkins	Tauzin
McDermott	Pickle	Thomas (GA)
McHugh	Poshard	Torres
McMillen (MD)	Price	Torricelli
McNulty	Rahall	Trafilant
Mfume	Rangel	Traxler
Miller (CA)	Roe	Udall
Mineta	Rose	Unsoeld
Moakley	Rostenkowski	Valentine
Mollohan	Rowland (GA)	Vento
Montgomery	Roybal	Visclosky
Moody	Russo	Volkmer
Morrison (CT)	Sabo	Walgren
Mrazek	Sangmeister	Waxman
Murtha	Savage	Weiss
Nagle	Sawyer	Wheat
Natcher	Scheuer	Whitten
Neal (MA)	Schroeder	Williams
Neal (NC)	Schumer	Wise
Nowak	Sikorski	Wolpe
Oakar	Sisisky	Wyden
Oberstar	Skaggs	Yates
Obey	Slaughter (NY)	Yatron
Olin	Smith (FL)	
Ortiz	Smith (IA)	

NAYS—198

Archer	Grant	Myers
Armey	Green	Nelson
Aspin	Gunderson	Nielson
Baker	Hamilton	Oxley
Ballenger	Hammerschmidt	Packard
Bartlett	Hancock	Parker
Barton	Hansen	Parris
Bates	Hastert	Pashayan
Bennett	Hefley	Paxon
Bentley	Henry	Penny
Bereuter	Herger	Petri
Biiley	Hiler	Pickett
Boehlert	Holloway	Porter
Broomfield	Hopkins	Pursell
Brown (CO)	Horton	Quillen
Buechner	Houghton	Ravenel
Bunning	Hubbard	Ray
Burton	Huckaby	Regula
Byron	Hunter	Rhodes
Callahan	Hutto	Ridge
Campbell (CA)	Hyde	Rinaldo
Chandler	Inhofe	Ritter
Clinger	Ireland	Roberts
Coble	Jacobs	Robinson
Coleman (MO)	James	Rogers
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Rohrbacher
Conte	Kasich	Roth
Cooper	Kolbe	Roukema
Coughlin	Kyl	Rowland (CT)
Cox	Lagomarsino	Saiki
Craig	Leach (IA)	Sarpalius
Crane	Lent	Saxton
Dannemeyer	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer
Darden	Lewis (FL)	Schiff
Davis	Lightfoot	Schneider
DeLay	Livingston	Schuetz
DeWine	Lloyd	Schulze
Dickinson	Lowery (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Dornan (CA)	Lukens, Donald	Sharp
Douglas	Machtley	Shaw
Dreier	Madigan	Shays
Duncan	Marlenee	Shumway
Edwards (OK)	Martin (IL)	Shuster
Emerson	McCollum	Skeen
English	McCrery	Skelton
Fawell	McCurdy	Slattery
Fields	McDade	Slaughter (VA)
Fish	McEwen	Smith (MS)
Frenzel	McGrath	Smith (NE)
Galleghy	McMillan (NC)	Smith (NJ)
Gallo	Meyers	Smith (TX)
Gekas	Michel	Smith (VT)
Gillmor	Miller (OH)	Smith, Denny
Gilman	Miller (WA)	(OR)
Gingrich	Molinari	Smith, Robert
Goodling	Moorhead	(NH)
Goss	Morella	Smith, Robert
Gradison	Morrison (WA)	(OR)
Grandy	Murphy	Snowe

Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stangeland
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist

Tallon
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh

Watkins
Weber
Weldon
Whittaker
Wilson
Wolf
Wyllie
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Annunzio
Bateman
Bilirakis
Clay

Collins
Courter
Hall (OH)
McCandless

Pepper
Richardson
Towns
Young (FL)

□ 1226

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. McCandless against.

Mrs. Collins for, with Mr. Courter against.

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Bilirakis against.

Messrs. DELAY, DARDEN, and McCURDY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT TODAY AND TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today and tomorrow the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be permitted to sit for the consideration of H.R. 1278 while the House is meeting under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS FLOOR ASSISTANT TO THE MINORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as floor assistant to the minority:

OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 26, 1989.

HON. JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my resignation as Floor Assistant to the Minority, effective close of business, April 30, 1989.

When I left the White House in January to return to the House of Representatives, I genuinely felt that I was "coming home." While my tenure has been far shorter than I anticipated, my respect and affection for this institution and the men and women who serve in it will long endure. I consider my service in the House one of the highest honors and most esteemed privileges of my professional career.

With warmest thanks for the many kindnesses and courtesies which you, the Repub-

lican Leader and your colleagues have accorded me through the years, I remain,

Cordially,

ALAN M. KRANOWITZ.

RESIGNATION OF ALAN M. KRANOWITZ AS MINORITY FLOOR ASSISTANT

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because we have just laid down before the House the resignation of floor assistant to the minority, Mr. Alan Kranowitz, so well known to Members on both sides of the aisle.

Alan has had cumulatively 25 years of Federal service. He was in the Ford White House for 2 years, and 7 years as the assistant to one of our former Members, Tom Loeffler from Texas, 4 years at the White House under President Reagan, and 3 of those years in charge of the House legislative team, and 1 as assistant to the President in charge of the entire legislative affairs operation.

He is an individual who has acquitted himself in an exemplary fashion in all of his tenure of Federal service, capped, of course, now as one of our House floor assistants. These are the kind of people we are most anxious to attract to Government service to serve as our right hands in the service of our great country.

I just want to offer my personal thanks and appreciation and congratulations to Alan Kranowitz for a life well spent in Federal service, and wish him well in his retirement to the outside where, yes, maybe there is a little bit more money to be made. All our best to his wife, Carol, and his two sons, Jeremy and David.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lament the House's loss. A friend of this institution, and a great public servant, Alan M. Kranowitz is leaving the Congress to join the majority of Americans who work in what we call the real world—the private sector. Alan has worked long and hard for his values and beliefs in two of our three branches of government.

After graduating from Yale University in 1963, Alan went to work for a distinguished Member of the other body, Senator THOMAS J. DODD as an executive assistant.

From 1971 to 1975, he served as Director of Legislative Affairs for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Following that, he served in the Ford administration as an assistant to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget from 1975 to 1977.

After serving two Republican Presidents with the utmost in professionalism and dedication, Alan returned to the other body from 1977 to 1978 as Director of Research for the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, all this experience and service was merely a prelude for some of Alan's greatest work—work that began in 1978 here in the House. Alan served as ad-

ministrative assistant to a friend of mine, and a friend of this House, the Honorable Tommy Loeffler of Texas from 1978 to 1984. During his time in the House, Alan distinguished himself as a fine political strategist and a hard-working Republican staffer.

So distinguished was his work that when he left the House, the Reagan administration quickly secured Alan's services. From 1985 to 1987 he was deputy assistant to the President for House liaison.

His work with the House was so effective that in 1988 Alan was promoted to Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs. In this job Alan was responsible for the Reagan administration's relations with all of Congress. The nature of this job obviously required someone with great perception and sure political instincts. Alan was the right man for the job. He completed difficult assignments on issues ranging from the Nicaraguan Contras to the budget and a wide range of domestic concerns.

In 1989, Alan returned to the House as floor assistant to the then-Republican whip, Dick Cheney of Wyoming. The Republican Conference was happy to have Alan back in the House, working for our side of the aisle. Unfortunately, this arrangement was not to last.

Well, everyone knows what happened to Dick Cheney. He now serves his country as Secretary of Defense.

Our Republican leader, the Honorable BOB MICHEL asked Alan to stay on as his floor assistant. Alan has done so, and served the Republican leadership well during a period of transition.

Now, as I said, Alan is moving on to a world with normal hours, and undoubtedly a more normal clientele. He is joining the National Association of Wholesale Distributors here in Washington, DC.

Alan Kranowitz, you will be missed by your friends here in the Congress. I am sure, however, that we will not lose touch with you. We all look forward to a continuing relationship with one of the Congress' dearest friends and ablest servants.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my name to the growing list of Members applauding the service of Alan Kranowitz. His presence will certainly be missed on this side of the aisle.

During the past 25 years, Alan has provided sage counsel and leadership to both the legislative and executive branches of our Government. He has taken on each new assignment with vigor and enthusiasm. I have mixed feelings about his leaving public life for on one hand, I am happy for him and his family, but on the other hand I feel that he will be hard to replace.

Mixed emotions aside, I am confident that he will be successful in the private sector. My only concern is that this is Alan's fourth new position in about as many months and I am not alone in wondering why he can't hold down a steady job. But I guess when we reflect on where he has worked over the past 25 years, it is not hard to see that none of his jobs have been steady.

Alan, good luck in the world of normal hours and better wages. Your work on our behalf will be missed here in the House, but I know

this is not the end of your long association with this body or the Federal Government.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to honor Mr. Alan Kranowitz, a great friend of this institution who is leaving Congress in order to join the private sector. After 25 years of public service, Alan will be greatly missed by Members of both parties.

The Members of this body came to know Alan very well in his 25 years of Federal service. His distinguished career includes 2 years in the Ford administration; 7 years as the assistant to one of our former Members, Tom Loeffler from Texas; and 4 years in the Reagan administration—2 years as deputy assistant to the President for House liaison and 1 year as assistant to the President for legislative affairs. In 1989, Alan returned to the House in his most recent position as floor assistant to the minority. Unfortunately, his tenure has been short lived.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my personal appreciation to Alan Kranowitz for time well spent in Federal service and wish him the best in his new pursuits. It is not often that we find someone as dedicated to public service as Alan and his resignation is indeed a great loss for this institution.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place into the RECORD the following remarks made on behalf of Alan Kranowitz, a good friend of mine and my predecessor. Alan is a real asset to this country, and I wish him the best as he pursues his new career:

REMARKS BY FORMER REPRESENTATIVE TOM LOEFFLER ON ALAN KRANOWITZ

Mr. Speaker, one of the very best leadership aides in the House of Representatives, our own Alan M. Kranowitz, is leaving us to pursue a new career as senior vice president for government relations of the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors. In association with my former colleagues, I want to congratulate him on a distinguished career in public service and wish him the best of luck in his new position.

For the past 25 years, Alan faithfully served our party and our government in a variety of roles. After graduating from Yale in 1963, Alan went to work for his home state senator, Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, where he spent six years as his executive assistant and administrative assistant.

From 1971-1975, Alan was director of Senate liaison for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and then spent two years as assistant director for legislative affairs at the Office of Management and Budget during the Ford Administration.

Alan was the director of the Senate Republican Policy Committee from 1977-1978 and joined my office as chief of staff in 1979. In 1985, President Reagan appointed Alan deputy assistant for legislative affairs in charge of the White House liaison team with the House of Representatives. In 1988, the President appointed him as his chief lobbyist with Congress.

Since leaving the White House earlier this year, Alan served in ranking leadership staff positions with former Republican Whip Dick Cheney and Republican Leader Bob Michel. President Reagan also appointed Alan to a five-year term on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

Alan's dedication to his work, his knowledge of House and Senate legislative procedures, his personal relationships with so many members of both parties here, made

him truly a unique individual who's presence will be missed. Whether on Capitol Hill working in the Congress or on Pennsylvania Avenue working for the President, Alan always brought his high standards to the job at hand.

One of those standards was Alan's adamant refusal to seek publicity for himself. He was more interested in having the credit from the fruits of his labor go to his boss. That was his satisfaction. But everyone who worked with him knew his value and respected him for the professional manner in which he always conducted himself. No one knows this better or appreciates it more than me.

Alan Kranowitz epitomizes the best in American government—a bright, capable, untiring public servant. Now, after 25 years of service, we are sorry to see him leave public service yet pleased that we had the opportunity to work with him. Our best wishes extend to his lovely wife, Carol, and to his two sons, Jeremy and David.

Alan and I had an expression that we used with one another to indicate a job well done and as I bid farewell to his government career—at least for the moment—I want to say, "Alan, you sure looked good on that horse!"

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to recognize an individual who has given so much to Members through his service as floor assistant. I speak of Mr. Alan Kranowitz. His dedication and commitment in this capacity, as well as his history of Federal service, are to be commended.

Mr. Kranowitz resignation as floor assistant to the minority comes to me, and I am certain to my colleagues, as a loss inevitable with personnel of such professional aptitude, intellect, and dependability. It is in the normal course of one's life that one must move on to "bigger and better things." He has certainly proven this theory to be true.

I know I will, personally, miss Alan as I have counted on him so much in the past. He has given our Government many years of outstanding Federal service and I commend him for that. I give him my personal thanks and wish him and his family the best of luck in the future.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join in warmly saluting Alan M. Kranowitz, a constituent in my Eighth Congressional District in Maryland, upon his retirement from the Federal Government.

Alan Kranowitz has worn many hats in his career. His quarter century of distinguished service includes 2 years in the Ford White House as Director of Legislative Affairs for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 7 years as administrative assistant to former Representative Loeffler, and 4 years at the White House under President Reagan. During 3 of those years, Alan served as Deputy Assistant to the President for House Liaison, in charge of the House legislative team.

His work with the House was so effective that Alan was promoted in 1988 to Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs. In this role, Alan was responsible for the Reagan administration's relations with all of Congress. Most recently, Alan served as minority floor assistant to Dick Cheney, Republican whip until his recent appointment as Secretary of Defense.

Alan's professionalism, competence, dedication, and integrity will be missed. I would like to wish Alan the best of luck with his future endeavors with the National Association of Wholesaler Distributors. As Shakespeare noted: "The force of his own merit makes his way."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, upon the resignation and recent departure of Alan Kranowitz as minority floor assistant, I add to that of my colleagues my own praise and thanks for the years of fine service rendered. I am particularly grateful for those years of service which Alan so faithfully gave in various capacities to the House of Representatives.

I first met Alan when he worked for my friend and colleague, Tommy Loeffler. Alan always conducted himself with dignity, perception, and sure political instinct. His service to his party and country have been marked with integrity, devotion, and loyalty. He will be greatly missed by all who were privileged to know him and work with him. He remains as an example of the truly dedicated and decent public servant.

Again, I offer my personal thanks and appreciation, and wish Alan continued success in both his personal life and his new professional challenges with the National Association of Wholesaler Distributors here in Washington, DC.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on behalf of the service of Alan Kranowitz.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2072, a bill making dire emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers, urgent supplementals, and correction enrollment errors for fiscal year 1989, and that I be permitted to include extraneous and tabular material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND TRANSFERS, URGENT SUPPLEMENTALS, AND CORRECTING ENROLLMENT ERRORS ACT OF 1989

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). Pursuant to House Resolution 135 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2072.

□ 1230

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2072) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers, urgent supplementals, and correcting enrollment errors for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes, with Mr. GLICKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that passage of this bill is essential or else we do not have any of the funds made available that are so vitally needed.

I would like to say to my colleagues that every effort was made to protect the House. All the debate on the other side of the aisle seemed to try to pull together things which are very, very different. There are three divisions which they group together, when that is not the case at all.

We do have the dire urgent supplemental items. We have others that are urgent and desirable where we cut back and transferred existing funds which does not increase the budget deficit whatsoever.

Then we have other items that will never be available unless increased income comes from taxes or otherwise. But it does let us have a chance to protect the House in conference.

Mr. Chairman, we are very proud of our record on the Committee on Appropriations.

We are \$187.6 billion below the Presidential requests since 1945. We are \$16.1 billion below President Reagan's requests since 1981.

At the same time we have seen to it that vital programs have gone forward. These accomplishments have not been based on assumptions or hallucinations. They are based on hearings from an average of 4,500 witnesses over an average of 150 hearing days and printed in 90,000 pages of hearings each year.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Appropriations was requested to approve a supplemental appropriations bill by the President in his message of April 3. The committee considered that other items also qualified as dire

emergencies, and still others are deemed essential by the committee to meet urgent needs if offsets are made or if additional revenues are made available.

Thus on April 18, 1989, the Committee on Appropriations reported the bill, H.R. 2072, a bill of three parts. I call your attention again to the three parts of the bill which our friends on the other side tend to put together:

First, dire emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers; second, urgent supplementals only, one, upon agreement by House and Senate conferees to a reduction of existing funds to offset such expenditure or, two, additional receipts to the Treasury to offset such expenditures are made; and third, corrections of enrollment errors, which is necessary.

May I point out again, and I wish you would all listen to this, with regards to drugs, the language provides that the funds remain available until expended, which leaves this item open to agreement by Congress and the executive.

Any reduction in drugs here means you are lowering the ceiling on what is available.

May I say again that the language that is written here requires the executive branch and the Congress to agree on the expenditure of these funds. I think in the history of the United States we never have faced anything one-tenth as serious as the drug situation. It shows up in AIDS, it shows up in murders, it shows up in everywhere you look. What we want to be sure from this side is that there is a ceiling high enough to do that which the President and the executive branch and the Congress may agree is necessary. Any effort here to defeat this bill or defeat the provision for drugs would certainly be shortsighted and would again be just lowering the ceiling on what is possible at a time when you need everything in sight.

Attention has not been paid enough here to the funds in here for the Justice Department. That money is essential to their activity. There are certain things there as far as hiring prosecutors, paying jurors, all those things that go with justice, those funds are going to have to be available or you will be unable to carry out the laws that we have in place.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is in compliance with the fiscal year 1989 requirements which provide for supplementals in the event of a dire emergency.

Funds in title I of this bill are for: First, dire emergencies and therefore do not have to be offset; second, mandatory programs which do not require offsets; and, third, accounts which are offset by transfers.

So the bill is in three parts, despite the efforts of the press and others to try to group them together.

Funds in title II of the bill are provided only under the terms of the general provision found on page 36 of the bill which states:

Funds provided in this title shall become available for obligation or expenditure, only (1) upon agreement by House and Senate conferees to a reduction of existing funds to offset such expenditures, or (2) additional receipts to the Treasury to offset such expenditures are made.

This provision will cause title II to be deficit neutral and will protect the House in any conference.

Thus, the accounts funded in this bill, upon presentation to the President, will meet the guidelines we have previously agreed upon.

This bill was the product of extensive committee hearings and is designed to meet the dire emergencies caused by the epidemic of drug abuse and the problems facing the homeless. The bill provides funding to continued much-needed medical care for our Nation's veterans, firefighting funds to protect our national forests, funding for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, and funds to address the Japanese-American internments during World War II.

The contents of the titles included in the bill follow:

Title I—Dire Emergency Supplementals and Transfers:

Chapter I—Emergency Drug Funding:
Subchapter A—Commerce-Justice-State.
Subchapter B—Treasury-Postal Service.
Chapter II—Judicial Retirement Fund.
Chapter III—Corps of Engineers, Civil Energy Programs.

Chapter IV—Migration and Refugee Assistance: International Peacekeeping Activities.

Chapter V—Forest Firefighting: Naval Petroleum Reserve Limitation.

Chapter VI—Trade Adjustment Assistance:

Foster Care and Adoption Assistance.
Rehabilitation Services and Handicapped Research.

Guaranteed Student Loans.
Prescription Drug Payment Review Commission.

Chapter VII—Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress.

Chapter VIII—Agricultural Marketing Service:

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.

Chapter IX—Federal Aviation Administration:

Installation and Use of Explosive Detection Equipment.

Chapter X—Department of the Treasury:

IRS—Processing Tax Returns.
IRS—Investigation, Collection, and Taxpayer Service.

Chapter XI—VA Compensation and Pensions:

VA Readjustment Benefits.
VA Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund.

VA Medical Care.
Court of Veterans Appeals.

Homeless Programs.
EPA, Salaries and Expenses.

EPA, Abatement, Control and Compliance.

EPA, Hazardous Substance Superfund.

NASA, Research and Program Management.

Title II—Urgent Supplemental Appropriations:

Chapter I—NOAA, Operations, Research, and Facilities:

Dept. of Justice, Legal Activities.

U.S. Attorneys, Salaries and Expenses.

Japanese Internment Fund.

FBI, Salaries and Expenses.

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Salaries and Expenses.

Defender Services.

Administrative Office of U.S. Courts.

Federal Judicial Center, Salaries and Expenses.

Maritime Administration, Federal Ship Financing Fund.

FCC, Salaries and Expenses.

SEC, Salaries and Expenses.

Chapter II—Department of Defense, Administrative Provisions.

Chapter III—Department of the Interior and Related Agencies—General Provisions.

Chapter IV—FAA, Aircraft Purchase Loan Guarantee.

Chapter V—OPM, Salaries and Expenses.

Chapter VI—Housing Programs, Rental Assistance:

Community Development Grants.

NSF, Research and Related Activities.

Title III—Technical Enrollment Corrections.

Title IV—General Provisions.

May I say that unless this bill passes, none of these funds will be available.

I also call your attention to the fact that the rules of the Committee on Appropriations do not require germaneness. There is no way to have gotten through the Committee on Appropriations the one or two items that each person is for. Our rules provide that all amendments are available, are recognizable in the committee, can be entertained without germaneness. That is on the theory that everybody is entitled to be heard some place, somewhere, somehow.

Your Committee on Appropriations, I repeat again, worked hard to bring you those things it absolutely must, which are accepted under the agreement we had between the House and the Senate and the President.

We have those other funds made possible by transferring existing funds for their use.

May I say this has to do with trying to protect us in the Senate conference.

I put in the RECORD here just how many amendments we have had to face in meetings with the Senate on supplementals.

Senate amendment to major supplemental appropriations bills

	Senate amendments
97th Congress, 1st Session; H.R. 3512—Making supplemental and further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1981.....	432
97th Congress, 2d Session; H.R. 6863—Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1982.....	183

Senate amendment to major supplemental appropriations bills—Continued

	Senate amendments
98th Congress, 1st Session; H.R. 3069—Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1983.....	254
98th Congress, 2d Session; H.R. 6040—Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1984.....	216
99th Congress, 1st Session; H.R. 2577—Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1985.....	341
99th Congress, 2d Session; H.R. 4515—Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1986.....	224
100th Congress, 1st Session; H.R. 1827—Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1987.....	437
100th Congress, 2d Session; H.R. 5026—Making dire emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1988.....	25

Unless we make reference to those here and then in the conference, it is doubtful whether we will be able to protect your interests.

Again this bill is in three parts. We have lived within the limits despite the efforts of our colleagues on the other side and the press to try to group them together.

We have a good bill and I hope we will have your support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say what a great honor it is to serve on the Appropriations Committee, and to have the privilege of working with the chairman of the committee, the dean of the House, JAMIE WHITTEN.

Let me also say how much I enjoy working with the members of the committee, and how much I value their friendship and cooperation. The Appropriations Committee is the hardest working, most dedicated, committee there is, in my opinion. It's a rare situation and an unpleasant one for me that involves conflict with the chairman and other members. I look forward to moving quickly to more pleasant issues than this supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2072 is a bill the excitement of which is only hinted at by its title, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Transfers, Urgent Supplementals, and Correcting Enrollment Errors Act, 1989. The title has everything in it but the kitchen sink, and so does the bill.

Under the budget summit agreement of 1987, the only supplementals that we are supposed to propose are for dire emergencies. And the administration submitted a pretty slim list of requests. First, some big mandatory items like: \$892 million for guaranteed student loans; \$854 million for veterans compensation and benefits; \$423 million for foster care and adoption as-

sistance, and \$126 million for trade adjustment assistance. No one disputes those.

Second, the administration asked for a few discretionary items: \$303 million for VA medical care; \$250 million for the cost of last year's forest fires; \$100 million for Soviet and other refugees; \$125 million by transfer for peacekeeping in southwest Africa, and some smaller items. All would have been offset by reductions in 1989 spending levels in certain domestic programs.

The committee took that \$2.3 billion in mandatory items, it took the \$700 million, rejected the offsets, and proceeded to add an additional \$2 billion in spending. It more than doubled the total cost of the bill and quadrupled the level of discretionary spending.

The largest item added was for additional antidrug programs, \$823 million, primarily in the Commerce, Justice, State area. It's important to realize that this amount goes well beyond even what was called for in last fall's drug bill authorization. It includes \$148 million in fiscal year 1990 requests, \$50 million that would otherwise have been added in 1990, and \$85 million that Congress decided not to fund in its regular bill last year. In this sense, the bill is clearly a gimmick to move 1990 budget authority into 1989, to provide room for more spending in 1990. But beyond that there was no judgment exercised. It was just—stick in whatever you can; not what is needed or what programs are running short of.

Also added was \$350 million in additional firefighting costs; \$250 million for Japanese-American internment payments, another item requested for 1990; \$153 million for the McKinney Homeless Act, programs for which the President requested full funding in 1990; \$88 million for public housing authority subsidies; \$75 million for the Federal Aviation Administration; and an additional \$45 million for VA medical care.

Imagine, all these items coming at a time supposedly of fiscal restraint. This was Christmas in April. And no offsets; \$5 billion in new spending. What happened to the concept of dire emergency?

If sticking 1990 funding into the 1989 supplemental to free up funding in other areas is dire, then I light my cigars with four alarm fires, you're all millionaires, and the end is near.

I remember the budgeteers, hearing about what we were up to, speaking out—No SILVRO, don't let it happen.

Why are we sitting in these endless budget meetings if there's no fiscal discipline exercised in carrying out the budget agreements.

And in this case, they were right.

We had spent all the money allocated under the 302 process last fall, when we provided nearly \$1 billion to

provide a supplemental, as part of last fall's continuing resolution substitute, the antidrug bill. In spending that money we also exceeded the totals in the budget summit agreement. And the projected deficit was well above the Gramm-Rudman target for 1989.

So here we came with a mammoth new spending measure, to break the bank that was already broke, making a mockery of the budget deficit reduction negotiations underway.

Something had to be done. I tried making suggestions for specific cuts that could be used to offset the increases—like \$515 million for the space station that was sitting there fenced off until May 15. Beyond making specific offsets, there are only two other alternatives—you either cut some of the fat out or you cut across the board.

None of those are particularly attractive if you've got too much spending in the bill to start with—the cuts or offsets will be large and painful. But the Republicans on the committee, God bless them, dug in and went to work. We spent 2 hours at the White House last week, trying to come up with a compromise that preserves the dire supplementals, postpones spending on programs slated for an increase next year, and has as small an offset as possible.

We got the President to agree that the veterans medical care was such an emergency that it justified spending new money without an offset. This was and is a tough fought compromise.

We were right. This bill was, and is, too big to swallow. The leadership on the other side finally admitted it.

And so they've come up with their own proposal, the Foley amendment. There's no big showdown here. This isn't Conte versus Foley. We've won 90 percent of the battle, which is to get people to realize you can't shovel all this money out there at this time and in this place. It's got to come from somewhere.

So then you've got to figure out where the money comes from. It's one of those questions with multiple options where none of the options are particularly appealing. Foley keeps the whole bloated thing and takes it out of Defense, which is one of the reasons they lost the White House last time around, I think. Conte tries to pare it down, gets the White House OK to spend some new money without offset, and tries to keep the offset on domestic discretionary as small as possible. It has one advantage that Foley doesn't. It will be signed. Which means the veterans will get their medical care.

But we've gotten ourselves into a mess here. And we've now got to dig our way out. With a little more cooperation between the Republicans and Democrats on the committee, this could have been worked out. I'm sorry

that the House has gotten caught up in this. I hope the committee has learned something from this experience.

But I think the Republicans have won a victory with the realization that there is no free lunch. Now we've just got to come up with a credit card to pay for this banquet, one that will obtain the approval of the credit manager.

And meanwhile, the veteran out there is still waiting for health care. It's a shame.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND THE JUDICIARY

The bill includes \$725,579,000 for emergency drug funding, compared to \$350 million in the Conte substitute. The main difference between the two approaches is that the Conte substitute concentrates on funding as much of the unfunded portions of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 as fiscally and programatically possible, while the committee bill reaches into every possible nook and cranny in the Department of Justice bureaucracy for places to spend money on drugs.

The Conte substitute funds nearly 80 percent of the unfunded parts of last fall's drug bill. Funds are included for personnel for the FBI, the DEA, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Marshals, the Bureau of Prisons, and State and local drug grants.

The committee bill not only funds the drug bill, it drags out \$85 million for 1989 requests that Congress, in its wisdom, declined to fund last year, it brings forward into 1989 \$148 million worth of 1990 requests in order to circumvent the budget summit and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and finally, it funds nearly \$50 million for programs not even requested in 1990. It's a grab bag.

It is time for us to get serious and sensible about drug funds. We cannot afford, nor is it wise, to continue to duck this national crisis by throwing money at it indiscriminately. We are now spending 500 percent more on Federal drugs law enforcement and abuse than we did in 1981. We haven't been pikers; we have provided the dough.

Has the situation improved? Are drugs harder to get? Are the streets safer? Are there fewer addicts today?

One thing we may have accomplished is that we are lowering the unemployment rate by creating thousands of new law enforcement positions at the Federal, State, and local levels. What are we doing here?

As part of the drug bill, we charged the drug czar with taking a good and thorough look at what we are doing. We gave him 6 months to come back and tell us what is working and what is not. I suspect that more weight is going to be given to the latter part of that question.

But the point is that we are going to dump more millions into programs which are not working in the committee bill before we even get the report of the drug czar. That makes no sense. That's just lock-step spending.

You are not fooling anyone. Your constituents know what is happening on their streets and to their kids. They want some new ideas, not just more of the same, which hasn't worked.

As of the end of March, halfway through the fiscal year, more than 60 percent of the funds we appropriated for antidrug programs remained unobligated in the Departments of Justice and Treasury, which would receive the vast bulk of the funds in the committee bill. There is no funding emergency, there is a drug emergency. Altogether, these agencies have more than \$4 billion in unobligated funds. They can't absorb all of this money.

The Conte substitute is a more moderate, more sensible approach. It doesn't scatter the money around just because some bureaucrat wants more to play with. It concentrates the funding on the drug bill programs, just as your constituents and press have called for, while we reserve the difference of nearly a half billion dollars until we get the report from the drug czar.

In title II of the bill and the Conte substitute, funds are provided to expand investigations and prosecutions of financial institution fraud cases and to enable the courts to meet the requirements of recommendations of the Sentencing Commission.

Funds are also included in both versions to avoid furloughs at the Federal Communications Commission and to enhance the resources of the Securities and Exchange Commission, in part to attack the backlog of utilities holding companies cases. And funds are provided to ensure the continued operations of essential weather services, including geostationary satellites.

Aside from the question of drug funding, the major difference between the committee bill and the Conte substitute within the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee is the elimination in the Conte bill of \$250 million for the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund—the payments to Japanese-Americans related to their internment during World War II. The Department of Justice, which has the responsibility for locating the recipients of this program, states that they will not be ready to make any substantial payments during this fiscal year. This is due in part to the directive in the authorizing legislation that the eldest recipients are to be paid first. The first payments will be made in fiscal 1990, so funds are not needed at this time.

CHAPTER SUMMARIES FOR DEFENSE IN THE
FISCAL YEAR 1989 SUPPLEMENTAL

Mr. Chairman, chapter II of title II of this bill, the Defense Department, provides no new budget authority but does put forth several language provisions:

First, we lift a ceiling imposed in the fiscal year 1989 bill on morale, welfare, and recreation funds.

Second, we remove restrictions on the Alaskan Command.

Third, we allow the Secretary of Defense to conduct a 15-month test program in recruiting incentives provided by the Defense College Funds.

Fourth, we put a provision in that will allow the Secretary of Defense to adjust wage rates for health professionals as authorized for the Veterans' Administration.

Fifth, and we charged the Defense Department to use the correct reprogramming procedures for moving funds into the mid-infrared advanced chemical laser or miracle.

Mr. Chairman, in title III, section 301 is simply a technical enrollment correction. In last year's Defense bill we put \$60 million in two places instead of one and this provision corrects that situation.

Section 573 prohibits funds in the supplemental to assist in solving the Japanese beetle problem in the Azores and registers the sense of Congress that the Defense Department should help correct the situation.

ENERGY AND WATER

TITLE I, CHAPTER III, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
CIVIL: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF
ENGINEERS, CIVIL

Provision: (Transfer of Funds).

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1989, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law as follows:

"General regulatory functions", \$1,100,000, to be derived by transfer from "Operation and maintenance, general."

"General expenses," \$2,600,000, to be derived by transfer from "Construction, general."

Description:

These transfers are to fund the congressionally approved 4.1 percent pay increase that went into effect on January 1, 1989. All other corps accounts absorbed the increase, but "general expenses" and "general regulatory functions" were unable to do so. They are the corps' most labor intensive accounts, and the administration agrees that they cannot absorb further reductions. The "general expenses" account funds Washington and Division management staff. "General regulatory functions" funds regulatory programs, such as dredge and fill permit processing.

The provision will have minimal impacts on the accounts from which funds are being transferred: "General construction" and "Operation and

maintenance." These are the corps' largest accounts. These accounts have low labor costs, and they can easily absorb the transfers by briefly deferring the execution of construction and maintenance contracts.

This supplemental request was included in President Reagan's fiscal year 1990 budget and has been endorsed by President Bush. Its enactment will increase fiscal year 1989 outlays by \$1.2 million.

No changes in Conte substitute, revenue neutral.

TITLE I, CHAPTER III, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
ENERGY PROGRAMS

Provision: Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities.

For an additional amount for uranium supply and enrichment activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), \$55,000,000, to remain available until expended:

Provided, That revenues received by the Department for the enrichment of uranium and estimated to total \$1,429,000,000 in fiscal year 1989, shall be retained and used for the specific purpose of offsetting costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment service activities as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302(b) of section 484 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, that the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as uranium enrichment revenues are received during fiscal year 1989 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1989 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

Description:

The Department of Energy is the only domestic supplier of enriched uranium. The purpose of this request is to provide funds for the purchase of additional power to be used in the production of enriched uranium. The Department has additional power requirements that were not anticipated when the fiscal year 1989 Energy and Water Development appropriation was enacted. Enactment of this provision would be revenue neutral, because the increase will be more than offset by receipts generated by sales of uranium enrichment services.

All of DOE's commercial deliveries can be made on schedule in fiscal year 1989 by using the remaining inventory of enriched uranium. Delayed or missed deliveries will be threatened in fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991 without increased production because of the lead time required for producing the enriched uranium product.

This provision was included in the President's supplemental request. It has been adopted by the committee without change.

No changes in Conte substitute, revenue neutral.

TITLE I, CHAPTER III, GENERAL PROVISIONS

Provision: Section 301. Sunset Harbor, CA: Section 1119(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of

1986 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

The total cost referred to in the preceding sentence may be increased by the Secretary by any amount contributed by non-Federal interests which is in excess of amount contributed by non-Federal interests under the preceding sentence.

Description: The Water Resources Development Act of 1986 authorized a feasibility study of Sunset Harbor, CA. The act imposed a limitation of \$900,000 on the total cost of the feasibility study. That ceiling has been reached, and the corps is not empowered to accept non-Federal contributions to complete the study. This provision of the bill will permit the corps to accept contributions from the non-Federal sponsors of the project to complete the study.

The provision was drafted by Public Works Committee staff, which originally proposed the cost ceiling. Enactment of the provision would have no Federal budget impact.

No changes in Conte substitute. No new budget authority or outlays.

Provision: Section 302. Exchange of Federal Land: Subsection 1. Exchange of Federal Public Land.

(a) EXCHANGE OF LAND.— * * * [A]t such time as the Blue Tee Corporation transfers all right, title, and interest in and to [35.03 acres of land located in Madison County, Illinois] to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary shall transfer all right, title, and interest in and to [58.64 acres situated in Madison County, Illinois, * * * and administered by the United States Army Corp (sic) of Engineers, which is constructing the Melvin Price Lock and Dam Project on this land] to the Blue Tee Corporation.

[Subsection 1(b) through subsection 2 omitted.]

Description: This provision permits a Federal land exchange with a private corporation in Illinois. The exchange must be executed within 2 years of the provision's enactment. Congressman COSTELLO is behind this proposal. The provision offers no particular gain or loss to the corps.

The land currently owned by the Government was acquired in connection with construction of the Melvin Price Lock and Dam. The land to be acquired by the corps would become available for lease to the city of Alton, IL, for development of a public marina.

The administration has proposed the addition of language to ensure that the exchange is equitable. The administration contends that, without such language, the Congress will establish a dangerous precedent by which major windfall profits or losses could be realized by either party in such exchanges. The administration's proposed language follows:

The values of the lands exchanged by the Secretary under this Act either shall be equal, or if they are not equal, the values shall be equalized by the payment of money to the grantor or to the Secretary as the cir-

cumstances require so long as the payment does not exceed 5 per centum of the total value of the lands or interests transferred out of Federal ownership. The Secretary shall try to reduce the amount of the payment of money to as small an amount as possible.

No changes in Conte substitute, revenue neutral.

Provision:

Section 303. Saylorville Lake, IA: From Construction, General funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, the Secretary of the Army is directed to construct Highway 415, segment "C" at the Saylorville Lake, IA, project in accordance with terms of the relocations contract executed on June 21, 1984, between the Rock Island District Engineer and the State of Iowa.

Description:

This provision directs the corps to complete the last segment of construction at a recreational project in NEAL SMITH's district in Iowa. This segment involves the development of road improvements.

The existing LCA, which predates the cost-sharing requirements of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, makes construction of the road a federal expense. The corps has indicated that it will not complete the project without explicit direction from Congress to do so, lest it run afoul of the provisions of the 1986 act. The road feature is a "separable element" of the project which would require cost-sharing under current law. If the corps requires a local contribution, then the question of whether the Federal Government is in breach of the 1984 LCA comes into play. The administration suggested its opposition to the provision on the grounds that: First, current law requires that the project costs should be shared equally between the Federal and non-Federal parties; and second, projects designed primarily for recreational purposes are not consistent with budgetary priorities.

The provision would increase neither budget authority nor outlays, as the corps is directed to complete the project with funds otherwise appropriated for the purpose.

No change in Conte substitute.

Provision:

Section 304. Sims Park, OH: The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall undertake a beach erosion control project at Sims Park, Euclid, OH, using funds appropriated under the heading "Construction, general" in title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation, 1988 (Public Law 100-202; 101 Stat. 107).

Description:

This provision directs the corps to proceed with a previously appropriated beach erosion control project in Mr. FEIGHAN's district in Ohio.

The corps has declined to undertake this work because Sims Park is a recreational facility. The administration supports, "using our scarce Federal resources for high-priority projects; for example, commercial navigation and flood control." The administration has suggested its opposition to this provision of the bill because of the facility's recreational nature.

The provision would not increase budget authority or outlays, as the project has already been appropriated.

No changes in Conte substitute.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

The bill and the Conte substitute both include provisions in the Dire Emergency title for additional refugee assistance, the United States share of new U.N. peacekeeping activities, and support for the electoral process in Poland.

For emergency refugee admissions and assistance, \$100 million is included, to be derived at the President's discretion either from new budget authority or by transfer from fiscal year 1989 foreign assistance appropriations. Of the \$100 million, \$85 million is for admission expenses for increased numbers of refugees from the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and other regions and \$15 million is for relief efforts for refugees in Africa and Asia.

Probably the most positive result so far from glasnost and perestroika is the dramatic increase in the number of refugees given exit permits to leave the Soviet Union. That number of human beings has risen from less than a thousand in 1986 to somewhere in the neighborhood of 50,000 this year. While we heartily welcome this development—and many of us have personally urged the Soviet Government to do this—the fact is that our refugee admissions operations are swamped. They need help to process this increase, and this bill, and the Conte substitute, will alleviate this situation.

The bill and the Conte substitute also provide \$125 million, by transfer from defense and foreign assistance funds, for the United States share of United Nations Peacekeeping Forces' expenses in Namibia, Angola, the Persian Gulf, and Afghanistan.

The current cessation of hostilities in each of these areas have come as a direct result of U.S. leadership. The Angola-Namibia agreement was an 8-year, single-minded crusade by our Assistant Secretary of State, Chester Crocker. We pumped hundreds of millions of dollars into the Afghan war against the Soviet invasion until the Russians finally pulled out. And I shouldn't have to remind anyone of the sacrifices we made in the Persian Gulf. It would be downright dishonorable to disengage ourselves at this point in the peace process. Peace doesn't come cheap, but the funding provided here is nothing compared to the costs of renewed conflict.

And finally in the foreign assistance chapter, the bill and the Conte substitute earmark \$200,000 from previously appropriated funds to support the historic electoral breakthrough in Poland. These funds will be transferred to the National Endowment for Democracy to carry out civic education and international observer missions and other activities.

The United States has been at the forefront in supporting Solidarity and other dissident groups in Poland, and our efforts are being rewarded. After long and difficult negotiations with the government, opposition groups have obtained the promise of free elections this coming June for Parliament. We must do what we can to ensure that those elections are indeed free and fair. This bill provides a modest contribution toward that end.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

Chapter V of title I and chapter III of title II include provision under the jurisdiction of the Interior Subcommittee. The Conte substitute includes identical provisions.

Chapter V provides \$600 million for reimbursement of 1988 and 1989 firefighting costs by agencies of the Interior and Agriculture Department. The bill provides \$30 million to the Bureau of Land Management; \$2.9 million to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; \$25 million to the National Park Service; \$33.6 million to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and \$508 million to the U.S. Forest Service. These amounts were transferred from other accounts within these departments to pay for firefighting costs which exceeded the amounts provided in the regular appropriation bill. An unexpectedly serious fire season accounted for this cost overrun.

The President requested only \$250 million for the Forest Service to cover firefighting costs.

Bill language is included restricting the use of funds to study the sale of the naval petroleum reserves.

Bill language is included which would allow Interior Department appropriations accounts to be reimbursed directly by any party for expenses related to any discharge of oil into the environment. The provision also expands the Department's emergency transfer authority to include activities related to oil spills.

Chapter III includes a provision—section 301—which prevents the Interior Department from listing the Al Capone house on the National Register of Historic Places. Section 302 authorizes the King Center and the National Park Service to use funds to construct a parking lot at the Martin Luther King National Historic Site.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

In the Department of Labor, the bill provides \$126,648,000 in supplemental

funds for training and benefits authorized by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, as amended by the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988. Last year's Trade Act expanded coverage and eligibility for workers adversely affected by increased imports. Of the funds provided, \$92,000,000 is for weekly benefits which, together with what we provided last year, will bring the total to \$224,000,000, and \$34,648,000 is for training, job search, and relocation allowances, bringing the total to \$80,000,000 for the program in 1989.

In the Department of Health and Human Services, the bill includes language requested by the President regarding the administrative budget of the Social Security Administration. The language included will delete a proviso included in the fiscal year 1989 appropriations act which limited the amount which the Social Security Administration can spend on data processing and telecommunications costs to \$170 million.

The bill also provides an additional \$423,345,000 in fiscal year 1989 to cover the Federal share of foster care and adoption assistance services that have already been provided by States. This is the amount requested by the President. This amount, in addition to the \$108,930,000 already provided for this purpose in the fiscal year 1989 appropriations act, will fully reimburse States for the Federal share of services provided in prior years. This will satisfy the Federal obligation required under this entitlement program.

Through report language, the committee has reprogrammed \$3.3 million within the Older Americans Act programs. This reprogramming will hold harmless the original Native American Indian tribes funded in fiscal year 1988, so that their grants are not reduced by virtue of the additional tribes made eligible for funding in fiscal year 1989.

In the Department of Education, H.R. 2072 contains bill language to clarify our intent on how much we appropriated for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant Program for fiscal year 1989. The program is scored as a mandatory account by the Congressional Budget Office, and should be exempt from the general across-the-board cut applied to discretionary programs in the fiscal year 1989 Labor/HHS/Education bill. Our intent was and remains that \$1,450,000 be available for these grants.

The bill also provides \$892,482,000 requested by the President for mandatory costs under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, bringing the total for GSL to over \$4 billion in fiscal year 1989. Unfortunately, interest rates have increased since we passed last year's bill, and most of this increase is to meet the new costs associ-

ated with the increased rates. This is an entitlement program.

The bill provides \$250,000 for start-up funding for the Prescription Drug Payment Review Commission which was created in the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988. This funding will not increase fiscal year 1989 outlays, because it will be funded through transfers of \$125,000 each from the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission and the Physician Payment Review Commission.

TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE-GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Chapters I and X of title I and chapter V of title II include provisions under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Subcommittee.

Chapter I, the so-called Emergency Drug Supplemental, includes \$4 million for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; \$35 million for Customs Service salaries and expenses; \$51 million for the Customs Service air interdiction program, and \$6 million for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

In contrast, the Conte substitute provides reduced but adequate resources for these agencies to continue the war on drugs. Specifically, \$1.75 million was added for the BATF; \$16.25 million for Customs Service salaries and expenses, and \$2 million for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. This amount is appropriate considering the ability of these agencies to absorb this funding before the end of the fiscal year and considering the drug czar's ongoing review of these programs. No funds were provided for the Customs Air Program. The committee bill would provide funds for the P-3 retrofit program, and that program is under review by the drug czar's office. No decision has been made to continue the program, and funds spent here could be premature or a waste of scarce Federal resources.

Chapter X includes transfers totaling \$81.5 million for three Treasury Department offices as requested by the President; \$2 million within the Office of the Secretary; \$5.5 million from unspecified Treasury Bureaus to the Financial Management Service; \$74 million within accounts of the Internal Revenue Service. There is no budget impact because of these transfers, and they are needed to meet unanticipated, uncontrollable costs.

Chapter V of title II includes bill language which would allow the U.S. Secret Service to extend the availability of \$2 million beyond fiscal year 1989 for the construction of security barriers around the south portion of the White House. Bill language requested by the administration was also included which would authorize the Office of Personnel Management to obligate until expended \$7 million already authorized for 1989 for costs to be incurred in implementing the rec-

ordkeeping system of the FERS system. This proposal would not affect outlays.

Bill language was included to give the Office of Personnel Management authority for setting wage rates for certain health care personnel. The committee claims that "this authority will allow OPM to maintain parity among Federal agencies regarding pay rates for health care personnel."

VETERANS' AFFAIRS AND HUD

TITLE I, CHAPTER XI, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, VETERANS' HEALTH RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Provision: Medical care.

For an additional amount for "Medical care," \$340,125,000: *Provided*, That of the sums appropriated under this heading in fiscal year 1989, not less than \$6,800,000,000 shall be available only for expenses in the personnel compensation and benefits object classifications.

Description:

A perceived crisis in the funding of VA medical care programs is driving H.R. 2072. As a result of underfunding, VA medical facilities are understaffed, and veterans with non-service-connected disabilities or ailments have been systematically denied treatments. Reports of prescriptions going unfilled and doctors' appointments being delayed for weeks are well documented.

The administration requested a supplemental appropriation of \$303,000,000 plus restrictions on veterans travel benefits that would have made an additional \$11,000,000 available for VA medical care in fiscal year 1989. This level of funding was considered adequate to keep FTET at or above its current level of 191,000.

The committee has raised the request to \$340,000,000, an amount sufficient to bring staffing levels up to 194,700, the level specified in the fiscal year 1989 report, by year's end. The VA would then be in a position to maintain employment at that level going into fiscal year 1990. The committee also deleted the proposed restrictions on beneficiary travel.

To adequately address the needs of veterans, the Conte substitute adopts the committee-recommended level of \$340,000,000.

TITLE I, CHAPTER XI, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, HOUSING PROGRAMS

Provision: Payments for operation of low-income housing projects.

For an additional amount for "Payments for operation of low-income housing projects," \$88,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1990: *Provided*, That from the foregoing amount, \$8,000,000 shall be made available, notwithstanding section 9(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, for increased security assistance.

Description:

HUD provides direct subsidies to public housing authorities for the op-

eration of public housing projects. The subsidy amount is determined by application of the Performance Funding System [PFS]. PFS establishes subsidy formulas calculated to yield the difference between the operating costs and income of efficiently operated projects.

During fiscal year 1988 and fiscal year 1989, there has been a shortfall of approximately \$70 million in funding for subsidies authorized under PFS; that is, 1 to 2 percent of calculated subsidies. In addition, the escalated costs of public housing insurance have not been built into the PFS formulas.

The \$88 million provided for operating subsidies in H.R. 2072 will be principally available to make up the shortfall. Any amounts remaining, after deduction of the \$8 million earmarked for enhanced security at housing projects, will be made available for "costs beyond control."

The \$8 million earmarked for enhanced security may be used for an array of activities, such as training of security personnel or installation of security devices.

PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING SUBSIDIES

H.R. 2072 provides \$80 million for the payment of supplemental operating subsidies to public housing authorities. These payments are intended to cover a shortfall in subsidy funding in fiscal years 1988 and 1989. The provision also includes \$8 million for enhanced security at public housing projects.

In fact, the payments would amount to a windfall gain for the housing authorities. These payments are not entitlements under law, and PHA's have already adjusted to any past shortfalls by reducing staff or other one-time costs or by using operating reserves

where costs could not be saved or deferred.

The shortfall does not constitute an emergency. There is neither a dire nor urgent need to provide additional subsidies. In fact, the provision was added as an amendment to the bill only after other nonemergency items were included.

The provision adds \$88 million in new budget authority in fiscal year 1989 and \$40 million in fiscal year 1989 outlays. Its inclusion violates the spirit of recent budget agreements, and it should be considered during the course of the regular appropriations process.

The \$8 million in funding for security measures can be made available through the public housing modernization program—which was funded at \$1.65 billion in fiscal year 1989—and through the regular public housing subsidies provided by PHA's.

STEWART B. MCKINNEY PROGRAMS FUNDED IN H.R. 2072

Program	Amount	Description
Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing.....	\$5,000,000	Adds money to HUD's moderate rehabilitation program. Money is earmarked for rehabilitation of single room occupancy units for use by the homeless.
Emergency Shelter Grants Program.....	\$73,000,000	Funds grants to localities, states and nonprofit organizations for the rehabilitation or development of homeless shelters. Operating costs are not included.
Transitional and Supportive Housing Demonstration Program.....	\$20,000,000	Provides funds to units of local governments, tribes and nonprofit organizations for the development of special group housing (for example, permanent housing for the handicapped and mentally disabled). This money can be used for operating costs.
Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless.....	\$10,000,000	Augments existing grants for innovative programs to assist the homeless.
V.A. Health Care.....	\$30,000,000	Provides additional money for V.A. Domiciliary Care and care for Chronically Mentally Ill veterans.
Emergency Food and Shelter Program.....	\$15,000,000	FEMA program providing emergency relief assistance in the form of food and shelter.

□ 1250

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate a point that I made earlier, and that point is that the distributions that are contemplated under the Foley amendment are going to cut into the very drug interdiction programs that the military has initiated upon direction by the Congress.

We had a briefing just a few days ago in the Armed Services Committee by General Olmsted, and the U.S. military, since we in the Congress gave them a lead agency role over Customs and over the Coast Guard in interdicting drug planes and drug ships, has gone out and started to work the southern border of the United States. They have turned drug planes back at the border that have gone down into the interior of Mexico. We have verified that some of those planes were carrying narcotics, and they have initiated a program that is slowing down this stream of cocaine into the United States. Yet under the Foley amendment we are cutting almost half a billion dollars in operation and maintenance moneys from the Department of Defense, much of which is being used for the drug interdiction operation right now.

They have finally gotten their act together. The U.S. military, per our direction, is moving forward, and this action we are taking is cutting them. It makes no sense to take money away from them in the drug interdiction program with one hand so we can posture and say we are spending drug program moneys with the other hand.

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what we are doing, and I urge all my colleagues to vote against the Foley amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the supplemental, and also, of course, in support of the Foley amendment.

I would like to bring to the attention of all the Members something that the chairman of the committee was kind enough to put in the bill. We have a big problem in public housing with drug users. We have hard-working people and honest people in public housing, and there can be 300 of them in a highrise, but if we get one family or one person there that is dealing with drugs, they can ruin the whole highrise. Yet in the past, public housing authorities have had to go through the most cumbersome, convoluted, and

tortured procedures to get this family out and to deal with them.

So what this proposal does—and there is \$8.2 million in there for this purpose—is it authorizes HUD to make grants to do any or all of the following: To provide training, communication equipment, supplies, and voluntary tenant patrols, to fund security and drug abuse prevention programs, to fund innovative programs designed to reduce drugs in public housing, to employ additional security personnel in public housing, and to employ individuals to investigate drug-related crime. This empowers public housing tenants to take care of their own lives, to fight drugs, and it will promote community pride.

There are many, many things in the supplemental agreement of which I am supportive, but I was particularly glad that this proposal, which some of us have worked on long and hard, was added. So I thank the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], for helping us with this proposal.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the Budget Committee and the House leadership sat down together to address our fiscal year 1990 budget and

our deficit problem and produced still another dud.

Evident in their budget plan is more overoptimistic economic assumptions, more accounting gimmicks, more unspecified solutions, more cooking of the books. Not evident is any progress whatsoever on the deficit.

The sad thing about all this is that the Budget Committee and the Members of Congress who end up supporting it know the numbers are fraudulent. If we are making any progress at all, it is coming solely from growth in the social security trust fund which has become the guarantor of irresponsible spending. Social Security ought to come off budget for Gramm-Rudman purposes and everybody knows it. And the irresponsible spending must stop and everybody knows that as well. This bill is more of the same, without any relation to budgetary constraints or solving the deficit problem.

Mr. Chairman, we are undermining our economic future, destroying our children's and grandchildren's economic opportunity and setting generation against generation.

The markets will not be fooled forever. When the realization comes that we are going nowhere, when the crisis hits, the pain will be infinitely greater for everyone than if we addressed this problem directly, honestly, and courageously now.

Our leadership, Mr. Chairman, is failing us. I urge a no vote on the supplemental. Send us back to work to do it responsibly and to do it right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding this time to me, and I want to commend him and the members of the subcommittee, especially the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], with whom we worked in terms of the housing provisions that are in this bill.

I, of course, rise in support of the dire emergency supplemental bill. I know it will provide funding for many important programs, especially for the VA hospitals. We have one in our area. It is a brand new hospital, but many of the beds are closed, and veterans are precluded from of health care they need.

There are the provisions for the fire fighting funds that are so necessary for our Forest Service to replace the KV funds and the Interior Department dollars that are necessary. Most importantly, from my perspective, though, this provides more of full funding for the McKinney Act. I would hope that all of my colleagues would want funding for this. Earlier this year I introduced a resolution asking for full funding in fiscal year 1989 for McKinney, and over 150 Members of the House cosponsored

that bill. Well, here it is. We have President Bush in the campaign and after the campaign in his inauguration address right in this Chamber asking for full funding for the McKinney Act. Vice President QUAYLE asked for full funding. Mr. Kemp, when he looked at the HUD funding, asked for full funding. He asked for those particular dollars because he needs them. The fact is that for many Americans, their only bedroom is a blanket and a grate in the street. Congress authorized the dollar, but we will not meet our promise unless we rise today to act and vote positively for this legislation.

There will be some amendments coming before us. I know that the Members have good intentions, and they want to try to fund this by cutting other things like defense discretionary funding. I intend to support the Foley amendment. I would ask the Members to oppose the Conte amendment because the Conte amendment cuts out all of the dollars in this legislation for the homeless.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was not in the Chamber when I said I am not going to offer my amendment.

Mr. VENTO. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I missed that. We are grateful that the gentleman is not going to offer that amendment, because I think the gentleman has been a good advocate for many of these programs. I know the basis on which he brought that amendment forward was not necessarily aimed specifically at this group, and I appreciate the gentleman's not offering that particular amendment. I wanted to underline for all the Members the importance of all this. We have won a convert, I guess, in the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. Chairman, I hope that today we can work together and pass the bill. I know we have tough budget problems. I know there are many who would argue with the nature of the way we have tried to resolve our budget problems, but in a body of 435 Members no one Member or even a small group of Members is able to prevail in terms of a single view. We have to accommodate many different programs and many interests, but surely one of our number one priorities should be, and it is, providing for those who cannot help themselves. I think the homeless certainly fall within this category, and I think as Americans, as we look at the polls and the support of our constituents, we should certainly do all we can to fund these programs. The McKinney Act is not just a shelter program but one that deals with the broad base of personal services to these people in our society who are homeless.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2072, the dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill and in opposition to the Conte substitute. H.R. 2072 will provide much needed supplemental moneys across the field of Federal Government programs. Most importantly, this legislation provides \$241.5 million for homeless assistance programs authorized in the Stewart B. McKinney Act and homeless prevention in the form of public housing operating assistance.

Additionally, there are many other significant funding proposals in the supplemental including an essential \$600 million for the forest fire fighting expenses incurred by the Interior Department and the U.S. Forest Service because of the fires in Yellowstone National Park and other areas. I also strongly support this bill because of the \$340 million in funding it provides for the Veterans' Administration health care system. This funding is needed to cover the shortfall in fiscal year 1989 funding for critical health care services for our Nation's veterans. The shortfall has resulted in severe cutbacks in health care services for veterans in Minnesota and other States. These reductions include reducing inpatient and outpatient visits for some veterans and limiting the dispensing of medications. As a Member of Congress, I have consistently supported adequate funding for veterans health care. Congress has made a commitment to veterans and that commitment must be honored. This is especially true as our veteran population ages and the demand for extended and geriatric care grows.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, that we have worked hard for many years to provide assistance to the millions of Americans whose bedroom is no more than a blanket or a steel grate. Congress was successful in passing comprehensive homeless assistance authorization legislation 2 years ago in the form of the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. This law, however, can only function with full funding of proven McKinney programs. While we stand and debate, albeit with the best of intentions, hundreds of thousands of children—the hope of our great Nation—are growing up on the street.

The funding sought here is modest. The need is documented. In its 1989 report on Hunger and Homelessness in America's Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors found an average increase of 13 percent in requests for emergency shelter. Requests for shelter by homeless families increased by an average of 18 percent. More telling are the statistics representing the unmet needs: 19 percent of the requests for emergency shelter in the survey cities were unmet. For homeless families, the figure was an average of 23 percent. Our shelters are turning away families with children when of the \$120 million authorized for emergency shelter grants, we have only appropriated \$46.5 million.

This scenario of underfunding can be replayed across the gamut of McKinney programs. In the Transitional Housing Program, for example, HUD has received about 400 applications requesting approximately \$270 million in funds. Only \$92 million is available. In the section 8 Single Room Occupancy Program, HUD has received applications for

11,500 units when there is only enough funding for 1,025 units. 91 percent of these units will not be funded at all.

Mr. Chairman, on the first day of the 101st Congress I introduced a resolution that called for the full funding of the McKinney Act. Over 150 Members of Congress joined me in co-sponsoring House Joint Resolution 31. Our former colleague and current Secretary of HUD, Jack Kemp, supports the full funding of McKinney. President Bush formally brought the kinder and gentler proposal to fully fund McKinney into the campaign of 1988. We must not allow the administration's "lip reading" rhetoric to remain mere lip service for real funding for homeless assistance. The \$241 million in the supplemental for McKinney programs and public housing operating assistance will make good on that promise by continuing to help the millions of homeless Americans while preventing thousands more from becoming homeless.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of the supplemental.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my dear friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the members of the committee that we have an unusual situation here, and I am not sure I fully understand it. It had been my understanding initially that there would be a king of the mountain arrangement, that the Foley amendment would be offered and then the Conte amendment would be offered, and then that we might or might not have a motion to recommit. So now it is difficult to know wherein to speak on the bill. So let me speak very briefly at this time, and hopefully I can come back later and amplify a few of my remarks.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, the original supplemental, as was requested, was \$2.1 billion. As was pointed out, the House Committee on Appropriations raised this to \$4.7 billion. Now, all of the additions, over \$2 billion, are all in the domestic sector. The rule waives the Budget Act, so why do we have a Budget Act if every time when we get in a tough bind, all we have got to do is just waive it and do not have to make it conform to the budget?

If the full amendment passes, the 1987 bipartisan summit amendment on defense funding for fiscal year 1989 of \$229.5 will be totally violated. It means nothing. We will go through a Budget Act, we get our figures, we go to committee to try to mark up, and this totally vitiates it.

In effect what we are doing here is saying we do not pay half of all the bills out of the defense. We are paying two-thirds out of defense.

So, we go into serious negotiations. We deal in good faith, and, as has been pointed out when my leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] spoke, what does this mean now?

What does it mean to the defense, if nothing else, if these cuts are put in this late in the year?

Mr. Chairman, according to Secretary Cheney the cuts would force him to freeze permanent changing stations disrupting plans of families and military families. He would have to stop payment on reenlistment bonuses which would seriously reduce our ability to retain any skilled people, and he would have to provide for the early release of 28,000 people scheduled to leave the service between now and the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, this would have very serious consequences. It is not fair. It is abrogating agreements. It is taking out of what we thought would be the funding level of defense, putting it over into the domestic sector when the domestic sector is adding all of the add-ons.

So, it is not fair, equitable. It is unwarranted intrusion onto the agreement and onto the defense budget, and I would certainly vote against the Foley amendment, and, if it passes, vote against the bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]. I would hope that he will be able to clarify a somewhat vague provision of this bill. At least it is vague in terms of my reading, and I would like to have it clarified because I think there are potential fiscal consequences here. It concerns the provision of the bill relating to the Alaska oil spill.

Mr. Chairman, the provision, as I understand it, would ensure that the Interior Department is directly reimbursed for costs it specifically has incurred in the cleanup. My concern is that the provision does not require Exxon, or any other outside group, to reimburse Interior. In my opinion the provision as stated leaves open the possibility that taxpayers may at some time in the future be put in the position of reimbursing Exxon or some other entry for the cleanup once it is concluded.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that the final bill for this cleanup could be monumental whether to Exxon or to other parties, and I realize that this provision only concerns the Interior Department, which is only one of the 14 agencies involved. However, I think most of my colleagues would agree with me that Interior, the Coast Guard, EPA, and other agencies involved should be reimbursed by those liable, whether criminally or civilly liable, for damages. In no way do I believe that the taxpayers should possibly be put in the position where they

should have to subsidize what I consider to be Exxon's reckless disregard for the environment.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, let us not forget in a related issue that Exxon under current law will have the luxury of writing off its cleanup costs anyway, but that is not at issue here. Right now I would like a clarification on the provision.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this provision was inserted upon the request of the subcommittee which I chair, and the purpose of the amendment is not to change the existing law in any respect. If Exxon is liable for the spill, Exxon remains liable for the spill, and this language does not purport to deal with that at all.

Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this language is to assure that the Department of the Interior agencies, which are advancing money for the purpose of dealing with the oil spill, are reimbursed for the funds they have advanced rather than having the reimbursement funds go back to the general Treasury, which would be the case in the event that this language was not placed in the bill.

I repeat that whatever liability Exxon had before remains with Exxon. I would agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] that Exxon ought to pay all the costs. It was a reprehensible act that Exxon perpetrated, but trying to go into the question of the liabilities that are involved here is something beyond the jurisdiction and purview of our subcommittee, and we did not deal with that. Our only purpose was to make sure that adequate funds were replaced for those that were used to deal with the spill.

Mr. Chairman, does that satisfy the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA]?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I believe it does. Certainly it is my understanding that we cannot determine liabilities here, but we can be certain on the legislative record that there is no implication here that the taxpayers are going to foot this bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this provision, it simply allows the Interior Department to be reimbursed directly for expenses incurred as a result of an oil spill cleanup effort in Alaska. The provision also expands the Department's emergency transfer authority to include activities related to the oil spills.

Simply put, this language set up a mechanism for the Interior Department to receive reimbursements from any nonfederal party, but it does not

preclude or address any determination with respect to liability for the oil spill in Alaska, and we are in total agreement, myself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the chairman of the committee and my good friend, with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA]. We feel, both of us, that the Exxon incident in Valdez was an environmental nightmare. Exxon should not be left off the hook for one nickel. It was mentioned that they are going to have writeoffs of a lot of the expenses from their Federal taxes. More so than that, they are now going out there, and they and other oil companies are raising the price of gas at the pump, which is unconscionable for what they have done to the environment in Alaska in not only making the taxpayers pay for it, but making the consumers of gasoline pay for it.

Do not worry about this committee. We are with the Interior Department and against Exxon.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the ranking member, and the author of the language, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. Chairman, I understand that we cannot right all the wrongs in this bill, but I am reasonably assured that we are of one mind, and there is no loophole here whereby the taxpayers are going to be taking this bill.

Mr. CONTE. Not at all, not at all.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. OK; I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the full committee chairman, for offering me this time, and I extend my appreciation to all members of the Committee on Appropriations for the courtesies that they have extended to me in the past week or two in my first efforts of bringing this subcommittee's part of the bill to the floor.

I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], my good friend, that I am pleased he is not offering his amendment. I would like to tell him that I think his efforts in acting as a mediator between the supplemental appropriation bill's supporters and the White House were to be commended, and I think he was going in the right direction, and with, perhaps, a little more support from all concerned we could have resolved our problem here. I want him to know that he is a terrific negotiator.

I like that preliminary agreement that he had. It could have served as a basis for a more comprehensive resolution of our problem.

Mr. Chairman, what I am going to try to do is give my colleagues the justification for what my responsibility, the subcommittee's responsibility, is for the portion of the bill that we are involved in. I hope this will not bore my colleagues.

□ 1310

Let me tell you that the bill provides \$1,438,418,000 in new budget authority for Departments and Agencies under the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee. That is a lot of money.

Now, nearly 60 percent of that total, or \$843,793,000 is provided for the VA's mandatory accounts, and every one of you will vote for it. There will not be one of you who will not. That is the money that goes for compensation and pensions, readjustment benefits, and the VA loan guarantee revolving fund. Every penny of that money—now get this—every penny of that money was requested by the President.

Now, the major discretionary item in the bill is the VA medical care account. We have provided a total of \$340,125,000 there, again a substantial sum. That is a very modest increase above the President's request of \$303 million which he believes to be adequate. We disagree with him on that point. I think you would, too.

I want you to know that the VA medical care account has already cut medical personnel from what we consider to be the bare minimum number—from 194,720 to 191,000. The fact is even to maintain that inadequate number of personnel, the VA has had to borrow money from supplies, from drugs, from equipment, and so on.

Ask any veteran who has recently gone to the medical services of the Veterans' Administration and looked for medical help.

It is not the fault of the agency. They are simply and plainly understaffed in view of the demand for services. Our veterans population is aging. We are not going to have less services. We are going to have more.

Let me say something else in connection with that. All of you have participated in the last 5 years in making every effort to adequately fund the VA medical care account. You have voted for each year in the appropriation bills some \$200 million over the President's request for VA medical care each year, for a total of \$1 billion over the last 5 years more than what the President of the United States had requested for that purpose.

What you did do was to maintain and fulfill the contract between this Nation and its veterans. For that you are to be commended. I am sure every veteran and his family in this country appreciates that effort on your part. That was over and above what the President requested. That was not a

budget buster. That was taken from other accounts within the budget so as not to exceed the President's total.

Now, if we do not get this money, the VA cannot go on much longer without cutting personnel. I want to tell you, they will have to begin to reduce staff. They are draining their resources now. As long as we are making progress, they will cooperate.

My judgment is you are looking at nothing later than the end of this month when they are going to have to begin reductions.

We have got to get this bill to the President as soon as possible. You all agree that this supplemental is necessary in this regard. I want to pledge my cooperation to speed it along and do anything I can to expedite.

There is another aspect of the bill that I think is important, and that has to do with the question of the additions, besides the VA medical care they are an important portion of the bill.

The bill contains \$153.5 million for homeless programs, and \$88 million for public housing operating subsidies, including \$8 million for increased security measures in public housing projects.

Now, the President on a number of occasions, you remember this, you were all in this room when he talked to us. Remember the State of the Union Address? Those were not hollow insincere words.

You remember his inaugural address, gentler and kinder. He meant it. I took him at his word. I will bet that you did, too. Is there anybody here who thought that the President of the United States was a liar? Raise your hands. Let me see it. Not one of you. We took him at his word and all America did, too. We felt better for it and for what he represents and for what he stood for on those occasions.

We are going to help him fulfill those commitments to the American people. This bill contains some of the fulfillment of those commitments. What are they?

Well, I will tell you exactly what they are in my portion of the bill. This portion of the bill that I am speaking of, the VA-HUD-independent agencies portion, \$30 million for the VA medical care account for homeless veterans who need that. I bet you are all for that.

There is \$73 million for HUD's Emergency Shelter Grants Program, \$5 million for the HUD Single Room Occupancy Homeless Program; \$20 million for the HUD Transitional and Supportive Housing Demonstration Programs; \$10 million for HUD's Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless; and \$15 million for FEMA in their Emergency Food and Shelter Program, an ongoing pro-

gram, an excellent program. No one would disagree with that \$15 million.

I want to tell you, when we had our hearing, the Secretary of HUD—I want you to pay attention to this, hear this now—the Secretary of HUD, a former distinguished Member of this body and a former member of the Appropriations Committee, a very fine gentleman, commended the Congress for those additions to the supplemental appropriations bill. His name is Jack Kemp. He is now the Secretary of HUD and he is committed to keeping hope alive. His statements to us were that this was needed, important, and he thanked us for it. It is on the hearing record.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that OMB is not in support of this additional funding for the homeless and the drug programs.

We are taking care of the offsets in the Foley amendment. That is agony. That is pain. We do not like to make these kinds of choices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think given our budget constraint problems, our efforts in that regard, that the Foley amendment will fully take care of the issue of the budgetary concerns here.

I know that some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have problems with defense offsets or cuts.

Think about this. In Monday's New York Times, the German Government just reversed a decision to extend compulsory military service from 15 months to 18 months. The consequences of that are this. The German Armed Forces will be reduced 20 percent—get this, reduced by 20 percent by the year 1993.

Now, think about that. They are on the front lines with the "Evil Empire," and that is what they are doing. Why should we spend billions, to defend them when they are reducing their armed forces by 20 percent. I think we can stand half a percent cut in defense and so do the American people.

I hope you will support the Foley amendment and then endorse the initiatives that President Bush has challenged us to be for.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As the former ranking Republican on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, let me just say to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], I certainly appreciate as a veteran all that the gentleman is doing on the Appropriations Committee for the veterans of this Nation.

As I have said to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], I have a great deal of respect for him.

The truth of the matter is, if you really want to help the veterans of this Nation, you will not do it by voting for the Foley amendment. You will not do it by voting for this supplemental.

President Bush is going to veto the supplemental as it stands now. If the Foley substitute prevails, he is going to veto that. That means that we are going to go back to the drawing board, and that means that the veterans in the hospitals throughout this Nation, all 172 of them, are not going to get the moneys they need right today in this dire supplemental.

□ 1320

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think the fault is not that of the Congress providing the funds. The fault would be that of the President in vetoing the bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. It will not be the fault of the President for vetoing the bill. It will be our fault for being irresponsible.

Let me just read the Members a letter from a very distinguished gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman believe that the Congress is irresponsible for putting in the money for the veterans?

Mr. SOLOMON. No. I believe the Congress is irresponsible for putting in all of these other add-ons in the Christmas tree that I spoke about earlier. That is with no disrespect to the chairman. He is a very good chairman.

Mr. Chairman, let me read a letter from another distinguished former Member of this House whom we all love and respect and admire, and have said so on this floor, Ed Derwinski. Let me read the last paragraph of his letter which says: "The President is clearly committed to a supplemental funding request for veterans' health care programs." This section of the bill is not a part of the legislative dispute.

Mr. Chairman, we are not disputing at all. We want it. We want it today. We would like to vote for it today.

The truth of the matter is that we had 30 Democrats on this side of the aisle vote against the rule. We had a 100-percent vote on our side against the rule. If Members stick with that and if we have to sustain the veto, we will come back immediately with the veterans' programs that we need so badly, so those of the Members who

support a strong national defense, please vote against the Foley amendment; please vote against the supplemental, and let us send the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and our good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], back to the drawing board with all of the subcommittee chairmen, and let us do it right, right for the veterans.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to bring to the attention of the House a number of items in the Foreign Operations section of the bill. That section provides \$100 million for refugees, very largely for Soviet refugees because we have about twice the number of Soviet refugees being let out of the Soviet Union than the administration had expected at the beginning of the fiscal year. We also provide the peacekeeping money which the administration requested for a number of regions of the world, and we provide assistance to the democratic forces who are trying to now participate in the new Polish elections under that remarkable changed situation which is occurring in Poland.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members not to vote against this bill with the Foley amendment, because anyone who does will greatly delay our ability to deal with all three of those problems, and those Polish elections, for instance, are not going to wait until we solve a parliamentary debate on the floor of the House of Representatives; neither will the need of Soviet refugees and neither will the need to have our peacekeeping forces in place to assure that we can prevent some serious problems in a number of areas around the world.

I understand what the game plan is by some people in the House. The game plan is that since they did not win the vote on the rule they plan to vote against the Foley amendment, which will fully pay for every item in this bill, and then having voted against the amendment that would have made this bill fiscally neutral, they will then have an excuse, I guess, to vote against the bill. I guess that means they think that it is OK to pay for funding the Contras but it is not OK to meet our needs to the homeless, it is not OK to fully fund the war on drugs that we said we were going to fight a year ago.

It is so ironic, and it is so cynical, to see this House year after year through the same device: What we see people doing in this House is during the election year they say, "Oh, are we against drugs, oh, oh, do we want to fight drugs," but then the minute the election passes, they say, "Well, gee whiz, we cannot afford it. The budget

summit is more important than the drug war," and then they suggest that we cut at least in half Mr. SMITH's subcommittee's effort to fully fund the war on drugs.

The administration had no objection whatsoever in suggesting that in order to fund their priorities we cut across the board on the domestic side of the budget, that we cut previous domestic appropriations by 1 full percent, but somehow they suggest that it is not fair if we are going to require the Pentagon to share in that reduction. I would simply point out, as I did a few moments earlier, that the summit which we agreed to 2 years ago provided for defense spending of \$294 billion on the outlay side. The President's budget today provides for that same fiscal year for defense outlays of \$298.3 billion, which is a \$4.3 billion overrun.

Mr. Chairman, all the Foley amendment does is to reduce that overrun by \$1.2 billion in outlays. That still leaves us \$3 billion over the target of the summit for outlays.

I would suggest that if Members vote "no" on Foley today they will delay the needed help for veterans, they will delay the needed help for Soviet refugees, they will delay the crucial help in assisting democratic forces in Poland. And I guess what we will be told then is that unless we are kinder and gentler to the Pentagon, we have to skip meeting everybody else's needs. I do not happen to agree with that.

The Foley amendment fully pays for all programs in this bill including veterans' health care, refugees, all of it. It pays for all of the discretionary increases in spending in the supplemental. It is fiscally responsible. It is balanced, because it asks the Pentagon to share in the squeeze along with everybody else in this society.

Unless Members support Foley in support of this bill, they are voting against the homeless, they are voting against a full-fledged war on drugs, they are voting against dealing with the problems of the Soviet refugees, and they are voting against assisting our democratic allies in Poland at the only time that it matters.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], a member of the committee.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague for giving me this opportunity to discuss the dire consequences of this bill (H.R. 2072) to the people of my district in New Mexico and to all Americans.

White Sands Missile Range—located in southern New Mexico—is home to one of the finest technology centers in the United States. Americans are far more secure today because of the many defense technologies researched,

tested, and developed at White Sands for over 40 years.

One such program is seriously affected by the legislation we are deliberating today. I speak of the midinfrared advanced chemical laser—also known as the MIRACL laser.

The MIRACL laser was built 6 years ago as part of the high energy laser systems test facility. When coupled to a telescoped beam director called Skylite, it can be aimed at moving targets. In tests, the laser has shot down missiles and drone aircraft. The U.S. Space Command recently announced plans to upgrade the laser so that it can be tested as an antisatellite weapon for star wars applications.

Section 205, if enacted into law, would have the effect of putting the MIRACL Program—as some have already stated—in mothballs.

This legislation addressed in this section is hardly classified as a dire emergency. However, if it's passed, it will create a dire emergency in New Mexico and to the future of America's defense technology.

While I can understand the concerns expressed by some of my colleagues over hesitations to produce and deploy Asat weaponry, the research and testing of such programs must continue. MIRACL has already proven a success in its early stages.

Congress can make decisions on production and deployment at a later time, but let us give MIRACL's testing a chance.

This Chamber should have the opportunity to devise a supplemental appropriations bill that addresses America's true dire emergencies, nothing more, nothing less.

Even though this bill contains many important provisions for our veterans, our homeless and others, I cannot support this bill because of the severe implications of section 205 to New Mexico and this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, here we are again, yet another underhanded, irresponsible effort to avoid fiscal accountability.

Yes, Virginia, there is a Christmas and it comes every day in Congress.

What started out as a dire emergency measure has eroded into a Christmas tree, with so many unnecessary and abusive ornaments that the tree now looks remarkably like some of my colleagues' favorite brand of tree, the much talked about continuing resolution.

Where is this all going to end?

When is this body going to stop abusing the legislative process and

abusing the American people and restore honesty and integrity to the process?

We have dire and urgent needs to address.

We woefully need immediate supplemental funding for veterans' medical care and for nationwide firefighting costs, but the Democratic leadership has endangered the well-being of 27 million American veterans, millions of acres of American property, and the lives of thousands of firefighters by loading up this measure to conform to their own private political needs.

The administration requested \$2.2 billion in emergency funding. The Appropriations Committee unilaterally inflated it to \$5 billion.

The administration asked for \$627 million in emergency discretionary funding. The committee fattened that request up to \$2.2 billion.

Included in that total is \$250 million for Japanese internment payments. That is a emergency need? Those payments cannot even be made in this year. They have thrown in \$800 million for drugs and \$88 million for public housing subsidies, most of which cannot be spent this year.

This is a vulgar abuse of the system.

Through chicanery, they are trying to bypass the budgeting process by frontloading next year's budget in order to avoid spending limits.

When will this gimmickry and deceit end?

Let us stop it right now.

□ 1330

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask that the gentleman's words be taken down, but on the assumption he does not understand the rules, I will not.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. Currently there are 2 minutes remaining on each side.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time to close debate.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that the first crack out of the box, the first bill that involves fiscal responsibility that we have on the floor of this House that we are going to go out and break the summit agreement and be fiscally irresponsible. The worst thing that we as a body can do is to send a message by breaking the summit agreement the first time out of the box. No one will ever believe it, no one will ever believe we have the intestinal fortitude to control our propensity to spend money. The financial markets will not believe it, our trading partners will not believe it, no one will believe we have the intestinal fortitude to do something about our spending.

A lot is being said about drugs here. Let me talk about that for a moment from the standpoint of the ranking member on the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

First, we have not been stingy in fighting the drug war. In 1986 we provided \$2.2 billion for fighting the drug war. In 1988 we provided \$3.8 billion to fight the drug war, and in 1989 we intended a total of \$5.3 billion to fight the drug war, and in 1990 the President has asked for \$5.9 billion to fight the drug war. We are not being stingy in fighting the drug war.

Let me say second that we do not solve the drug problem just by throwing money at it. We solve it by doing something that is tough, and by taking tough measures to apprehend, to try and to incarcerate criminals, to punish the purchasers as well as the pushers, to have drug testing, to do what Secretary Kemp and Director Bennett are going to try to get tough in our housing projects. We just do not throw money at it, and the American people do not want us to just throw money at it. They want us to get tough.

What the President has proposed are those things that have a dire need for additional money. We should go with the President. We should go with what the President has proposed and not simply load everything into the bill and be fiscally irresponsible again.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, and especially the provision providing for funding for the Japanese-Americans interned during the Second World War.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong support for the provision in this measure which helps to redress the wrongs perpetrated by our Government against American citizens of Japanese descent during World War II. The bill appropriates \$250 million to fund the program authorized by the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which was passed by both Houses of Congress last year.

The internment policy undertaken by the U.S. Government during World War II was a tragic error. The policy authorized U.S. Army troops to round up thousands of Japanese-Americans on the west coast and force them into relocation camps. This disgraceful program was not motivated by reason, it was driven by wartime hysteria and racial prejudice.

During my assignment as a member of the United States Army to Japan in 1946-47, I met a number of Japanese-Americans who had fled the United States and returned to Japan because of their mistreatment here. That people should emigrate from the United States to flee persecution demonstrates how far the United States Government had strayed from the principles upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. Chairman, there is no adequate financial compensation for the fundamental violation of

civil liberties and the humiliation that these individuals suffered. However, the payments to the surviving internees funded by this legislation are a symbol of the strong affirmation by this Government that a terrible mistake was made which will never be repeated.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleagues that we did everything that we could to help the President justify signing this bill. He was unaware, and the debate has not called attention to this, but after talking to him I pointed out to him that the money for drugs remains available until expended, which means that any expenditure will be worked out between the White House and the Congress. I do not know how we can protect anybody more than that.

The second thing we have here is transfer of money between accounts.

The third one that we have in here is to protect the House, when we go to conference on supplementals. In the 97th Congress, 1st session, we had 432 Senate amendments; in the 97th Congress, 2d session, 183 amendments; in the 98th Congress, 1st session, 254 amendments and in the second session of the 98th Congress 216 amendments, and so on. If we had not put urgent supplemental items in here, and they are not in here unless additional money is made available, then we have no way to protect our position in the conference with the Senate.

I repeat again, the President is right in the middle of handling this drug money because we keep it available until expended. The other thing is we transfer funds from existing authority to these purposes, and the other thing we put in here is more money so that we can protect the House in the conference with the Senate. I do not believe any Member could do better than that, and no one on the other side of the aisle has offered anything nearly as good.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill H.R. 2072, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1989. The legislation totals \$4.7 billion, a full \$2.6 billion more than what was requested by the administration. There is much that has been added to the request that I support. I favor the appropriations for antidrug programs, for guaranteed student loans, for veterans' benefits, trade adjustment assistance, and the Federal Aviation Administration operations. I would be pleased to support these items as contained in the bill. However, this measure goes far beyond just those increases.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana did not send me to Washington to vote for large spending bills. Every day, thousands of people in my district and across this Nation get their pay checks and pay their bills, all without running a deficit. The Federal Government should do no less than average working men and women.

Mr. Chairman, while I have only been a Member of Congress for a short time, I think I already know when we are living beyond our means. In the final analysis this supplemental appropriations bill just won't help our Nation balance our books. It is just too rich for me and for the people I represent in the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the major issues of today's debate concern broad questions of budget limits, offsets, defense versus domestic programs—all measured in billions of dollars. I am very interested in those questions and what my colleagues have to say about them, of course.

But in the context of those macroissues, we are also engaged in a weighing of priorities for Federal funding, and I have asked for a few moments of the House's time to offer my views on one program in particular—the air traffic controllers' incentive pay demonstration project.

If ever there was a case for the creation of a new program on short order, this is it. I don't care if you call it "dire," "emergency," "urgent," or even "technical correction"—we need this program and we need it now.

Late last year, after a frightening number of near misses in the Chicago airspace, the Federal Aviation Administration issued an action plan for air safety in Chicago. A major part of that plan was the drafting of a pay demonstration project to help the FAA attract the best people to the hardest posts.

As sent up by the administration, the FAA's project would have provided up to 20 percent in bonus pay for controllers at facilities at four facilities for 5 years. The airspaces involved would have been Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Oakland. The price tag for the FAA proposal was \$7 million.

As amended by the Appropriations Committee, the project was reduced to 10 percent incentive pay for one airspace for 2 years. The new price tag: \$2 million.

The only good thing about this change was that the committee picked the airspace with the greatest need—Chicago—for which I am grateful. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I think the project has been reduced to the point where it will not help in recruiting or retention.

A report released today by the General Accounting Office states that the "FAA believes the key to further improvement [in air traffic control problems] rests with the success of FAA's project to increase pay at O'Hare and other facilities."

The GAO report goes on to say that "the FAA anticipates that the project will result in 'full and stable employment * * *'; more experienced employees occupying safety-related positions; higher levels of full-performance-level employees; and the reduced use of overtime.'"

These are the very goals of the FAA action plan to meet an emergency understaffing need but the cut in the project will deny that need.

Slashing the scope of the program like this has, in my opinion, created a token project—it appears that we're trying to do something about the air traffic control problem. In reality, cutting the incentive differential in half, and shortening the guarantee of its availability to 2

years, simply will not attract the topnotch ATC's we need to apply for—or remain at—our most stressful airports.

What we need to do is sweeten the pot to make it worthwhile for these highly skilled public servants to move themselves and their families to the very jobs they have worked hard to avoid or escape.

The mere rumor that we might enact a meaningful demonstration project resulted in an amazing increase in applications for the O'Hare TRACON, for example. However, as doubts have spread about our commitment and our will to help, transfer applications have dropped out of sight. And who can blame them.

The arguments in favor of cutting the FAA's proposal are in the committee report accompanying this bill, and I find them wholly inadequate.

One argument is that, with a 20-percent differential, the pay of air traffic controllers will be equal or close to that of other, more senior public officials.

I don't want to drag us back to January's pay raise debate, but the fact that Assistant Secretaries are underpaid is a direct result of our failure to do the right thing. How many times do we have to shoot ourselves in the foot?

Another committee argument is that it does not take 5 years to assess a pilot project, so let's cut it to 2. The 5 years is probably not necessary to see if the project helps in recruitment and retention; but that's not why the project should be 5 years long. If the guaranteed availability of the incentive pay does not extend for some meaningful period of time, then nobody is going to bite.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the committee's action is well-intentioned. I am sure it sees the cuts it has made to this proposal to be a much-needed part of the overall congressional effort to control spending.

Yet, even with that in mind, we cannot lose sight of the consequences of misjudgment at this critical time in air safety. And we all know how unforgiving mistakes in matters of air safety can be.

In conclusion, let me express out loud my hope that the administration's proposal fares better in the Senate and that the House managers in the conference will take that opportunity to let the air traffic controller incentive pay project work.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong concern over the cutbacks in the Federal Aviation Administration's proposed pay demonstration program made by the Committee on Appropriations.

The administration had requested a \$7 million fiscal year 1989 supplemental to begin providing a 20-percent pay differential to air traffic controllers and other important safety personnel at certain critically understaffed facilities in New York, Chicago, and California. This 20-percent differential is very much needed to attract experienced controllers to the FAA air traffic facilities that handle the most traffic and are coincidentally in high-cost-of-living areas.

FAA has had a longstanding problem attracting experienced controllers to these facilities and the impact on our air transportation system has been significant. Simply put, not

as much traffic can be moved without more people. The results are delays, inconvenience, and, from time to time, safety problems.

The committee bill limits the pay project to the Chicago facilities and limits the differential to 10 percent, thereby leaving critical New York and California facilities without any relief to the ongoing staffing problems. Air traffic delays on the east and west coast will continue to be neglected and will grow worse as traffic demand goes up.

This lack of funding is a major shortcoming in the bill before us, and I hope it can be remedied.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2072, the emergency supplemental. I am particularly pleased that H.R. 2072 includes \$250 million for redress to Japanese-Americans who were interned during World War II.

The internment of Japanese-Americans during the Second World War is one of the most reprehensible episodes in our Nation's history. I was very proud to join my colleagues last session when we voted to provide redress to victims of this terrible injustice.

Unfortunately, despite the broad bipartisan support demonstrated for this legislation last session, the Reagan and Bush administrations have been reluctant to fund the redress program. The Civil Liberties Act authorizes \$500 million in fiscal year 1990 for compensation for Americans of Japanese ancestry who were forcibly interned during World War II. I was deeply disappointed when President Reagan included only \$20 million for redress in his final budget, and President Bush did not correct this in his subsequent budget refinements. However, I was very pleased when the Appropriations Committee acted to include \$250 million for redress in the emergency supplemental.

It is urgent that the redress program be promptly and fully funded. It is an overdue gesture of apology to the thousands of men, women, and children whose lives were disrupted and who lost their homes, jobs, and possessions as a result of their internment. Many of the internees are now elderly, and as Congress delays funding, fewer of the internees will survive to benefit from the redress program. As a result, in this case justice delayed may truly be justice denied.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2072.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill as it relates to veterans health care. I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. WHITTEN, and the able ranking minority member, Mr. CONTE, for the action they have taken to meet the pressing needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I also want to commend the new chairman of the Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies, my good friend BOB TRAXLER, of Michigan, and the ranking minority member, Mr. GREEN, for the speedy action they have taken to help move this legislation to the floor of the House. The first hearing Mr. TRAXLER held as chairman was on the need for the VA supplemental, and I was privileged to join him at that hearing. The gentleman from Michigan has been a friend of veterans for many, many years, and I speak for all of my colleagues in expressing our pleasure that he is the chair-

man of the subcommittee handling the new Department's appropriations.

This measure includes \$701 million in funds to pay compensation and pension benefits to millions of veterans with service-connected disabilities and to surviving spouses of veterans who died while serving their country or of a service-connected disability. It also includes \$22 million in supplemental funding for veterans readjustment benefits and \$120 million for the loan guaranty revolving fund, which pays claims to lenders on defaulted housing loans. I am also pleased that the committee included \$24.9 million for the general operating expenses account, which will be used to avoid further cutbacks in employment in the Veterans' Benefits Administration [VBA] and to restore to the National Cemetery System funds which were reprogrammed earlier this year to VBA.

This amount will also permit increased staffing in the Office of General Counsel to accommodate workload generated by the creation of a new court of veterans appeals. Funds of \$3.1 million are included in the bill to allow the court to begin its operations by September 1, 1989. The \$370 million for veterans health care will serve to replenish equipment and nonrecurring maintenance accounts, provide additional personnel to medical centers to support additional outpatient workload, allow the activation of recently refurbished or constructed treatment facilities, and permit an increase in the community nursing home patient census, which has fallen by more than 25 percent.

It was less than 2 months ago that members of the House and Senate Committees on Veterans' Affairs and members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies met with OMB Director Darman and Secretary Derwinski to talk about the urgent need for a supplemental appropriation for veterans health care. This supplemental goes a long way to resolve the crisis we discussed at that meeting. Although it will not allow the VA to restore all of the service cutbacks which have taken place since the beginning of this fiscal year, it will prevent further cutbacks in employment and services for the remainder of this year. Without this supplemental, even more drastic action would have to be taken and such action would adversely affect thousands of our Nation's deserving veterans.

I support the supplemental appropriation that is proposed for veterans health care, and I urge my colleagues to support it. We need to act now. The longer we delay action, the more veterans that will be denied health care.

I want to remind my colleagues that the funds contained in this supplemental for veterans health care will only be available until the end of this fiscal year. The Department of Veterans Affairs will be forced to make another round of health care cutbacks affecting hundreds of thousands of veterans if the Congress does not provide sufficient funds in the budget resolution for veterans health care for fiscal year 1990, which we will be considering next week.

According to a recent Congressional Budget Office [CBO] estimate, the annual cost of the health care services we are funding in this

supplemental is \$500 million. Thus, we need to add this amount in fiscal year 1990 to continue providing the health care services which the funds included in this bill will cover in 1989. I hope the budget summit agreement will not restrict the House from raising the level of health care funds to the amount needed during the next fiscal year. I say this because it makes no sense to vote for this supplemental, and then to approve a budget resolution which will require further cutbacks in veterans health care 5 months from now.

We cannot expect the Department to wisely and efficiently spend the scarce resources which we provide to it if its spending authority is in a constant state of uncertainty. I call this matter to your attention since the Budget Committee is meeting this week to agree on a funding level for all programs in fiscal year 1990. I urge my colleagues to get in touch with the Budget Committee and encourage the committee to bring the funding level up to the level CBO estimates will be required to continue a current services budget for the next fiscal year. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the estimate the committee received from the Congressional Budget Office be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Subject: Medical Care Estimate.

This morning you asked me to estimate what the 1990 baseline would be for VA Medical Care if a supplemental of \$462 million were included in the 1989 base. The \$462 million assumed supplemental level is the sum of \$432 million, which the VA says would be the annualized amount associated with the \$340 million supplemental ordered reported by House Appropriations, plus the \$30 million McKinney supplemental, also ordered reported. The estimate is shown below:

	1989 current baseline	1989 assumed supplemental	1989 revised estimate	1990 revised estimate
Budget authority.....	10,542,546	462,000	11,004,546	11,803,476
Outlays, prior.....	1,283,480	0	1,283,480	1,525,942
Outlays, new.....	9,006,590	397,320	9,463,910	10,150,989
Total outlays.....	10,350,070	397,320	10,747,390	11,676,931

To my knowledge, the veterans' health care system has not faced a situation like the one it now faces since the end of World War II. We have been talking for more than 10 years now about the impending surge of veterans from that war who will increasingly turn to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care. Well, as we speak, that increase in demand has occurred. Monthly application for medical care reached a new high in January 1989. But the funds to provide the care being demanded were not requested by the previous administration.

Mr. Chairman, we're way behind the curve on this problem and I'm not sure we'll ever catch up. In the past four budgets, the administration has requested funds to build a total of 120 nursing home beds. That's 30 beds a year to meet the needs of over 6 million veterans who are now over the age of 65. Instead of converting underutilized hospital beds to meet the demand for nursing home beds, the Department of Veterans Affairs is simply shutting these beds down. Since the beginning of this fiscal year, the Department has reduced

the number of veterans being cared for in community nursing homes at VA expense by over 25 percent. This is a reduction of 3,300 veterans. Across the country, nursing home beds are being closed. Veterans who previously were provided nursing home care at Department expense are simply told that someone else will have to pay for their care. In addition, the Department has told thousands of eligible veterans that they should seek medical care from other providers. If this isn't a crisis, I don't know what is.

Recently, Dr. Donald Custis, the former Chief Medical Director of the Department's Veterans' Health Service and Research Administration and Mr. Frank Morrone, a former budget officer, furnished me with their thoughts and analysis on the impending crisis. I believe that they are a very accurate description of what is going on with regard to the Federal budget for health care. There follows excerpts from their excellent analysis:

THE FEDERAL HEALTH BUDGET AND HEALTH CARE FOR VETERANS—FISCAL YEAR 1990

INTRODUCTION

This paper is an update of an article with the same title that appeared in the January 1989 issue of Paraplegia News. Much of the new information included has its basis in the FY 1990 President's Budget.

It is clear that the national budget deficit problems are driving health policy as well as policy in many other major domestic program areas. The efforts to reduce the federal deficit force reductions in funding necessary to support operating programs at their current levels. Since these reductions are usually arbitrary they are made irrespective of the direct and indirect impact on the ultimate beneficiary. Because of the lack of necessary funds the major issues of health care in the U.S. have been inadequately addressed in the FY 1990 budget proposals presented to Congress. The result is disjointed health policy where decisions are influenced most by the mechanisms that would be most effective in contributing to cost reduction—shortrun solutions rather than longer term strategies for change.

COMPONENTS OF FEDERAL HEALTH BUDGET

Medicare

The Administration budget proposes \$5 billion in savings in Medicare outlays for FY 1990. The savings can be categorized as follows:

DRG update factor would be limited to the hospital market basket increase less 2.5 percent.

Capital payments would be limited to 18 percent below cost.

The indirect medical education payment would be reduced by almost half the current rate.

Savings of \$1 billion in Part B physician payments.

The continuing annual effort to control costs by reducing the prospective Medicare budget requirements by billions of dollars has had a profound effect on the private health care economy. Hospitals continue to close or reduce services in growing numbers (81 hospitals affected in 1988 in 27 states). Many of the hospitals that cannot continue to operate are found in small towns and rural areas and are of 200 bed size or smaller. Such facilities are in locales where alternatives for hospital care may not exist in or near the community.

The principal factor in these closures are the numbers of patients hospitalized, the

level of third party reimbursement for episodes of care, length of stay and the ability of the hospital to control or reduce its operating costs. Smaller hospitals have a more difficult time controlling costs because many are built in and cannot be reduced further and, with dropping patient census and fewer patients, the income, which must be spread over fewer patient days is inadequate under the Medicare payment system. Further aggravating this situation are a variety of other factors such as the competition for nurses and their increased costs to hospitals, a problem that is national in scope and beyond the control of hospitals.

The impact of the Medicare reductions over the past several years has forced major changes on the health care scene making medical care much less accessible to larger segments of the population. A preliminary analysis by the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission (PROPAC) indicates that more than 50% of all hospitals will lose money treating Medicare patients in FY 1989 further aggravating an environment of decreasing amounts of uncompensated care availability.

During the past several years Part B (physicians services) costs have risen dramatically—15 percent growth in Part B costs last year. Although the shift from inpatient to outpatient care forced by the prospective payment system (DRG's) might seem to be an underlying cause, this is apparently only a minor factor. The 400 percent increase in physician costs between 1976 and 1986 is primarily due to volume growth of 6 percent/year—9 percent/year recently. The reasons for this volume growth are:

The aging of the population which brings about higher utilization because of more frequent episodes of acute illness and more chronic illness.

The growth in the number of physicians—making physician care more accessible.

Increased income of a sizeable portion of the elderly.

Technological advances—more technology available for use in diagnosis and treatment.

Shift from inpatient care to outpatient care.

Part B premiums that the elderly must pay will be increased further in FY 1990 and future years if proposals are enacted to move them to a level designed to cover 28% or 29% of costs rather than the 25% of costs covered currently. This is becoming more of a burden to the many who already are experiencing enormous annual out of pocket costs for health care.

Medicaid

The inadequate funding of this program continues in the FY 1990 budget proposals. The new administration is proposing to cover children and pregnant women under a Medicaid expansion. The program, however, does not address the real problem of the one million people who are denied care each year because they cannot pay for medical care nor does it address the 14 million individuals who need health care but do not seek it because they know they cannot afford it.

In this context it should be noted that:

The percentage of individuals who did not visit a doctor in the past year increased from 19% in 1982 to 33% in 1986.

30 percent of low income pregnant women received no health care during their first trimester.

30 percent of black and hispanic hypertensive had not had a blood pressure check within one year.

Most recent estimates indicate that 16 percent of the population of the U.S. is uninsured—or 37 million individuals and the number is growing as more individuals fail to meet the increasingly stringent Medicaid criteria for eligibility.

Of the 37 million 75 percent are workers and their families who are not provided medical care insurance by their employers and who are not eligible for Medicaid. It is further estimated that one out of five children in the U.S. are not covered by health care insurance.

Veterans medical care

The FY 1990 budget proposal for the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) falls far below the funding level necessary to provide quality health care to eligible needy veterans. Veterans will be denied care in increasing numbers and those veterans who are least able to help themselves will lose access to care that is essential to their well being. The safety net for medically indigent veterans is disappearing and the Department of Veterans Affairs is no longer able to assure that all needy veterans can or will receive medical care. The following summarizes the impact of the FY 1990 funding proposal for the Department of Veterans Affairs medical programs:

Medical care

By all accounts, the DVA medical care program has suffered a severe shortfall of funding in FY 1989 that has been documented at about \$620 million for health care and an additional deficiency for the medical equipment purchase backlog that approximates \$1 billion. This shortfall is not addressed in the FY 1990 budget but at this writing is being addressed as an FY 1989 supplemental appropriation issue. The new Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs has requested supplemental support for FY 1989 and additional funding for FY 1990—but at levels far below that which could be considered adequate. The details of this Department of Veterans Affairs admitted shortfall were extensively documented in hearings held by the House¹ and Senate Veterans Affairs committees on September 7 and 9, 1988 respectively.

The budget proposes reductions in Community Nursing Home Care for veterans. A reduction of 3449 average daily census (ADC) which will result in 11,862 fewer patients treated in FY 1990 than in FY 1989.

¹ Hearing before the subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, 100th Congress, second session, September 7, 1988, Serial No. 100-58.

This is primarily offset by a proposed increase in VA Nursing Homes or State Nursing Home program but results in a net decrease of 1575 in ADC and 7983 fewer patients treated. This reduction targets the older World War I and II veterans who currently present the greatest need for nursing home care.

The DVA domiciliary program is proposed to be reduced by 2441 ADC and 6371 patients treated. There is no offsetting proposal for the accommodation of these veterans who usually have difficulty resocializing, are suffering medical and psychiatric problems and may have no home to go to and inadequate income. This is grossly inconsistent with the Administration's professed desire to address the medically indigent homeless problem.

The DVA workload for hospital inpatients treated will be reduced below the FY 1988 level in spite of evidence which indicates that numbers of patients needing treatment will increase substantially as a result of the aging of the veteran population. Although it might be reasonable to expect some of this decrease to shift to outpatient care, the projected workload for FY 1990 outpatient visits has been established as a level below that for FY 1988 thus limiting the opportunity for such shifts to occur. This limiting of access to health care for veterans is proposed in defiance of an increasing demand for health care on the part of veterans.

As in previous years, the Administration is proposing a 1% productivity improvement that imposes a reduction of approximately 2000 health care personnel.

Although PROPAC has predicted that there will be a 5% cost of living adjustment in FY 1990—this is not anticipated in the budget and will result in a shortfall of over \$200 million in FY 1990 which will likely have to be absorbed causing further reductions in personnel.

Employees automatic within grade increases were not included in the budget—an amount that is estimated to be in excess of \$50 million which must be absorbed by the medical care personnel account.

No provision has been made for predictable increases in other employee benefits for FY 1990 (e.g. health benefits).

Decentralized Hospital Computer Program initiatives in mental health are required to be offset by decreases of \$27 million and 659 employees—in advance of demonstrated savings.

There is recognition of the role of the VA in the treatment of AIDS patients where increases in the funds and personnel for AIDS clinical programs are \$55 million and 625 employees.

Education and training activities which are a part of the major mission of the VA are being curtailed—reductions are proposed as follows:—175 medical residents;—25 dental residents;—60 Psychology residents;—37 Administrative trainers; and—67 Instructional support personnel. There will be no increases in the funding of or opportunities for continuing education of VA staff.

There is a legislative proposal for copayments for medical care for category B and C patients as follows:

Veterans will be required to pay \$5 (B) and \$10 (C) for out-patient visits;

Veterans will be required to pay \$3 (B) and \$5 (C) for prescriptions;

Veterans will be required to pay \$9 per day for hospital in-patient care (both B and C).

In addition, Category C in-patients are required to make the same copayments as Medicare beneficiaries.

Medical and prosthetic research

The budget reduces the appropriation request for medical and prosthetic research \$13 million below FY 1989 and reduces employment by 616.

The \$13 million reduction is proposed for investigator initiated research—the backbone of research in the VA. This will result in a reduction in new proposals that can be funded as well as a cut back in commitments already made to investigators who have ongoing projects.

Health Services Research, which would help the VA improve and become more efficient in service delivery, is not to be increased in FY 1990. Because of past absorptions, this is, in reality, a reduction.

Rehabilitation Research—crucial to the care of veterans and their unique problems remains constant in FY 1990. In reality, this is a reduction because the costs for operating the program will have increased.

Since no cost of living adjustment is anticipated for FY 1990 the likelihood is that any such increase would also have to be absorbed, further reducing medical and prosthetic research capability.

Medical administration

A further reduction of six employees will further inhibit the management capability of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Since an employee cost of living adjustment is not anticipated in the budget further reductions in personnel can be anticipated at a time when the medical care program is being severely stressed.

Health Professions Scholarships will increase by \$653 thousand. These programs will support 310 nursing, 40 physical therapists and 30 pharmacy students.

FEDERAL HEALTH CARE BUDGET BY FUNCTION

[Outlays in millions of dollars]

Category of health care budget	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990 proposals	Percent change		Average annual percent change
							1989-90	1985-90	
Medicare	65,822	70,164	75,120	78,878	86,778	94,918	9.4	44.2	8.84
Medicaid	22,655	24,995	27,435	30,462	34,301	37,616	9.7	66.0	13.21
Other health care service	4,329	3,855	5,181	5,557	6,257	6,396	2.2	47.7	9.55
Education and training	468	529	556	541	536	459	-14.4	-1.9	-3.8
Research ¹	5,433	5,894	6,138	7,173	7,887	8,594	9.0	58.2	11.64
(VA)	(215)	(181)	(195)	(197)	(206)	(199)	-3.4	-7.4	-1.49
(DOD)	5,648	6,075	6,333	7,370	8,093	8,793	8.8	65.6	13.13
Consumer and occupational health and safety	1,182	1,165	1,197	1,285	1,345	1,316	-2.2	11.3	2.27
Veterans and medical care	9,547	9,872	10,266	10,755	11,155	11,313	1.4	18.5	3.70
Department of Defense: Health	8,950	10,080	11,152	12,053	12,619	13,212	4.7	47.6	9.52
Total	118,386	126,554	137,045	146,704	160,878	173,824	8.0	46.8	9.37

¹ Details for DOD and VA included in this line is shown in parentheses.

² Bush proposal for Medicaid coverage for pregnant women and children included.

³ Estimate.

Medicare and Medicaid combined, continue to consume increasing proportions of the federal health dollar and, since these programs are placing the greatest strains on the health care budget, all other health functions are experiencing a decline in their share of the budget available and actual dollar reductions in some instances. Even though other components of the federal health sector are experiencing declines or stabilization, proposals for funding do not allow adequate increases for Medicare and Medicaid. An exception occurs in the research component where the Department of Health and Human Services has received increased funding for AIDS related research programs.

It is distressing to follow the funding experience of the veterans medical care program which has experienced a constant uninterrupted decline in the share of the federal health care budget since 1985 a trend that began in the late 1970's. This program, an integral part of the health care system designed to meet a commitment made by the federal government to veterans, continues to be squeezed to the point where health care access for needy veterans is increasingly difficult and quality of service is seriously eroding.

Using data from a recent DVA analysis it is possible to gain perspective on the efforts of funding policy on the medical care programs. It is apparent that the DVA has become considerably more cost efficient over the time period and that although the nominal dollars available for care have grown, deflated dollars have remained relatively constant. Workload continues to increase in all programs with insufficient funding to meet the calculated requirement to assure access and quality care for needy veterans.

If the DVA medical programs were to receive the same share of the federal health budget in FY 1990 as it received in FY 1985 its proposed budget would be \$2.7 billion higher than that proposed by the Administration. If it were to receive the same increase as that proposed for Medicare for FY 1990 (9.4%) the program budget would have been \$5.0 billion higher than the President's Budget. It would seem that the obligation of the federal government to veterans is at least equal to, if not higher, than that to the general population.

Clearly, the funding philosophy does not consider the medical need of veterans nor does it reflect an understanding of the roles of the DVA in the larger health care system. This is evidenced in FY 1989 by a demonstrated shortfall in veterans medical care programs alone that approaches \$1 billion, a back-log of equipment needs and an irreversible shortfall in the need for construction, repair and maintenance of the DVA medical care system. The accumulated deficits can be indisputably documented. The federal health budget is being artificially constrained and the inadequate funding for federal health programs in general is apparent from cursory study of tables 2 and 4.

CONCLUSIONS

It was clear in FY 1989 that the inadequate fiscal support policy as reflected in the President's Budget was having a severe negative impact on the VA medical care delivery system that was characterized as follows:

1. A continuing growing aging veteran population requiring increasing amounts of health care;
2. Continuing increases in inpatient workload;

3. Large increments in outpatient workload;

4. Increasing long-term care workload (the DVA being the only long-term care refuge for veterans, especially those over 65), since Medicare does not provide such coverage and Medicaid serves only a third of those who have exhausted their financial resources;

5. Increasing evidence of denial of care to veterans who need outpatient care but are being screened out, legitimately, utilizing more subjective interpretations of existing law;

6. Increasing evidence of rationing of high-cost inpatient care;

7. Queues for elective surgery and for long-term care beds, especially nursing home care;

8. Unfunded medical equipment needs that approach the one billion dollar level (see 12 below);

9. Outmoded technology and physical plant;

10. The growing AIDS epidemic imposing new burdens of caring from 7 percent of the AIDS victims in the U.S.; and

11. Deteriorating staff morale.

12. Increasing use of nonrecurring funds to meet recurring obligations. This will have a devastating long-run impact on the VA health care system since recurring obligations will accrue without a budget base to support them. There is clear evidence that in FY 1988 numerous medical centers used all of their equipment funds and maintenance and repair funds to pay salaries that were inadequately funded. It is not possible for the VA health care system to be required to maintain a personnel ceiling of 194,720 and not be provided funding to support that employment ceiling and the special pay rates that must be established for the Veterans Administration to remain competitive—especially in the area of nursing care.

These are among the most obvious effects of the inadequate budget that have been identified through our independent survey efforts have now been substantiated by hearings held by the House and Senate Veterans Affairs Committees. There is now evidence in FY 1989 of curtailment of care in the VA system with medical centers closing clinics to new appointments and some medical centers closing inpatient care to Category B and C veterans.

The budget inadequacies will force major structural changes in the location and availability of veterans health care in the short run. The unfortunate consequence is the forcing of change in this large component of the health care system in the absence of a long run strategy for the entire health care system. Such indirect action threatens the viability of the veterans health care system in terms of its ability to meet its primary obligation to eligible veterans while the gaps created in the system by such action are not adequately addressed. This is taking place in an environment where the role of the DVA medical care system is not understood with respect to how its programs fit into the larger health care system.

To demonstrate this latter point consider four general program areas that have been given explicit recognition by the new administration: AIDS, research, substance abuse and the homeless. The Veterans Health Services and Research Administration (VHS&RA) has large programs and years of experience in each of these four areas, yet it has not been funded as necessary to meet these high priority program areas. A brief

review of these four VHS&RA programs is instructive:

AIDS

The DVA has provided care to over 6% of all AIDS patients in the U.S. Since beginning of the AIDS epidemic, over 5800 veterans have been treated, 2161 in 1988 alone. It is expected that approximately 2800 new patients with AIDS will be seen in 1989 and 3600 in 1990, in addition to two to three times as many patients with ARC and HIV infection. Medical centers in the epicenters of the disease (east, west and gulf coasts) are the hardest hit. However, all medical centers will need resources to implement universal blood and body fluid precautions as a result of the epidemic.

Based on data from the VHS&RA the FY 1988 cost of AIDS program was \$131 million—\$23 million was appropriated and \$108 million had to be taken from other items in the health care budget to cover the costs. The increasing epidemic will cost \$165 million in FY 1990 and the amount that will have to be absorbed with current funding proposals is \$80 million.

RESEARCH

AIDS research, would be increased if additional resources became available. Medical research has developed a critical mass of investigators in AIDS-related research via the Special Solicitation for AIDS projects and the request for establishment of AIDS centers. In addition, Health Services Research and Development will initiate a multi-medical center project on the delivery of health care to AIDS patients costing approximately \$400,000 in 1990. The investigators at the AIDS centers will be initiating approximately 15 new research projects in 1990 and would increase those new starts to approximately 25 with additional funding of \$900,000.

As mentioned above the FY 1990 budget for research in VHS&RA has been decreased by \$13 million thus compromising the ability and capacity to carry out a role for which it has a unique capacity and opportunity. In FY 1990 \$7.5 million will be spent on AIDS research by DVA. Six percent of the \$1.6 billion appropriated to the secretary of Health and Human Services for the research and prevention of AIDS would amount to \$112 million if VHS&RA were to be considered in a reallocation of such funds in FY 1990.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAMS

As of the end of 1988, approximately 150 of the VA's 172 medical centers and outpatient clinics had drug, alcohol or combined substance treatment programs in operation. Modalities involved include inpatient treatment, outpatient care, methadone maintenance in 35 settings, and the contract halfway house program under which approximately 90 VA medical centers contract with approximately 400 community halfway houses for ongoing residential treatment of alcohol and other substance abusers. Of particular relevance in understanding VA programming in drug and alcohol abuse is the fact that the typical patient being treated within the VA in this sector is a multiple substance abuser. Drugs of abuse usually include alcohol, and one or more other drugs, with cocaine and marijuana being the primary associated drugs of abuse. As a result of this phenomenon, most VA treatment programs, whether they are identified as drug or alcohol programs, actually treat combined substance abusers. Indeed, many programs have begun to define themselves

as substance abuse programs rather than as alcohol treatment or drug treatment. Thus, fiscal differentiation of alcohol and drug abuse treatment programs is becoming less relevant in view of clinical reality.

The budget estimate for alcohol and drug abuse treatment is \$340,481,000 in 1989 and \$349,913,000 in 1990. The 1989 figure does not include the \$1 million authorized by section 2501 of PL 100-690 which provides for conducting an evaluation of drug and alcohol programs in 1989. To date, no authorized amounts included in this public law have been appropriated for the DVA.

HOMELESS PROGRAMS

The VHS&RA has developed a comprehensive network of health care services for our Nation's veterans. Many of these services and programs, although not specifically designed for the homeless, have assisted homeless veterans. In addition to the array of general VA services, two programs are authorized through legislation with specific mandates to provide health care services to homeless veterans: the pilot Homeless Chronically Mentally Ill (HCMI) program and the Domiciliary Care for Homeless Veterans (DCHV) program. The 1990 request includes \$13,872,000 for HCMI and \$10,852,000 for the DCHV program.

The HCMI Program, was initially activated under the authority of P.L. 100-6. The authorization for this program was recently extended by P.L. 100-322. Through these public laws, the DVA is authorized to contract with community-based psychiatric residential treatment programs to provide treatment and rehabilitation for homeless veterans that suffer from chronic mental illness. The DCHV program was established as a specialized treatment component within the DVA domiciliary care program. Authorized by P.L. 100-71, the DCHV program provides rehabilitation and treatment to veterans in need of clinical services who are homeless or whose living situation is so tenuous that they are at serious risk for homelessness. The focus of the program is to provide treatment that will prepare the veterans to return to independent living. The FY 1990 budget is proposing a reduction of 2440 in domiciliary census and 6370 patients treated at a time when such programs have been given priority.

Total funding levels for these two programs are \$23,619,000 in 1989 and \$24,724,000 in 1990. No appropriation has been provided and program costs have been absorbed. The resource levels will support 43 HCMI programs and an estimated 446 additional domiciliary average census. The authorized funding level provided in the McKinney Act Amendments of 1988 is \$30 million, \$15 million for each program.

With funding additional therapeutic components would be established within the HCMI programs and the DCHV programs would activate new sites and expand existing programs. Based on proposed legislation recently introduced by the Congress, HCMI program officials could link Compensated Work Therapy Programs with Therapeutic Residences for up to 15 new components which would allow VHS&RA to care for approximately 150-200 additional veterans. The average daily census in the DCHV program would increase by approximately 210 if the program was funded at the level authorized in the McKinney Act. It should be noted that approximately one third of the homeless are veterans—but one third of the funds to be allocated to the homeless programs are not available for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that portions of federal funds appropriated these national priorities be made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs to address the veteran components of the problem areas. This would place badly needed resources in ongoing programs to address these pressing problems in the veteran population. The federal budget would not be increased overall if such a reallocation could be achieved.

It is timely to consider the entire health care system in terms of meeting the challenge of increasing costs and increasing needs of the growing elderly population. All of the quick fixes are but temporary solutions to a complex medical care problem. And, in the case of programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs results in denial of needed care to those who have been given a government promise to care for him who has borne the battle.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, as we consider this emergency supplemental appropriations bill I feel it is unfortunate that the House has been put into a situation of voting on a supplemental appropriations with some emergency funding. Granted, most of the programs included in this supplemental are worthy of funds, but I question the emergency in some areas.

I do applaud the committee on several items that need immediate assistance. One specific example is the transfer of funds within the Farmers Home Administration from guaranteed loans to direct operating loans. Without this transfer, many States will continue to turn away farmers during this critical time of planting because no money is available for operating costs.

In addition, the committee has included some important report language regarding the Disaster Assistance Program. The language brings to attention the neglect shown by the Department of Agriculture in administering the 1988 Disaster Act and policies regarding non-program crops. Many good items are included in this legislation which cost no additional money, such as the two I have already mentioned. Undoubtedly, many programs need emergency assistance such as veterans medical programs, foster care and adoption assistance, guaranteed student loans, and the requested amount for firefighting which has now been doubled. There is no question that the emergency funds are needed, however, let's keep it just that, emergency.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Conte amendment.

The supplemental includes \$250 million to begin implementation of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988. The Conte amendment strips this starting payment from the bill.

It was in the considered judgment of NEAL SMITH, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary to begin redress payments with the supplemental. I salute Chairman SMITH for his leadership to include this amount in the subcommittee and full committee bills.

It was a proud day for me personally and for our country when Congress enacted the Civil Liberties Act last year. We stood very tall in the eyes of the world. Our Nation admitted that a terrible mistake was made over 45 years ago when the civil and constitutional rights of persons of Japanese ancestry were

violated. And we made a promise to make redress to those still alive.

Mr. Chairman, this is a promise we must keep. We have the first real opportunity with the supplemental to begin to keep our promise.

Each day we delay payments, more and more survivors of the incarceration will die. The youngest of these loyal Americans is now approaching 50, and the oldest located survivor is 106. To delay any further would take from the quality of what we did, and would show the world that this was only an empty gesture.

The Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil Constitutional Rights, which I chair, conducted hearings in March on the authorization request of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. The Civil Rights Division, through its Office of Redress Administration [ORA], is responsible for carrying out the implementation of the act.

According to testimony at the hearing, we learned that the ORA, working on a shoestring budget, has done an excellent job thus far. The supplemental, as passed by the committee, will give ORA \$6.4 million needed to begin full implementation of the Civil Liberties Act.

ORA has been in contact with over 54,000 potentially eligible persons thus far, well over 80 percent of the estimated 60,000 eligible persons. The road to payment for most of these claims will be straightforward, verifying the identity of the person and that the person was incarcerated during the war.

ORA testified that the Justice Department asked the Office of Management and Budget for \$500 million for payments for 1989. ORA will be able to make the 12,500 payments the \$250 million represents.

On the day the House passed H.R. 442 in 1987, our Nation celebrated the bicentennial of the Constitution. There was no more fitting tribute to the strength of our Constitution than to attempt to remove this infamous blot on our history by formally acknowledging the wrong done to Japanese-Americans and to provide token monetary redress. We have the opportunity to begin this promise with the supplemental. Let us not walk away from that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, nearly 50 years is delay enough. I urge a no vote on the Conte amendment.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the American veterans. I strongly endorse this legislation for the proposed \$1.2 billion appropriation for the Veterans' Affairs Department. I particularly would like to stress the need for the \$370 million which would provide a necessary—although temporary—lifeline to an ailing veterans' health care system.

Last year, I began hearing an increasing number of complaints from patients and caregivers alike regarding the quality of care at the Portland VAMC and cutbacks in many VA health care programs. Last September, in a response to these complaints, I testified in front of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to detail the wholly unacceptable conditions to which Oregon veterans and their caregivers were being subjected.

Unfortunately, budget shortfalls have required additional cuts in services at the Portland VAMC, and veterans who expect—and who deserve—to receive VA medical treatment are being turned away.

Last month, in response to these continued complaints, I met with Portland VAMC Director Barry Bell. What I learned in that meeting, and from subsequent information provided to me by Mr. Bell, shocked and disturbed me:

When the new VA Medical Center was opened in February 1988, one 39-bed ward was not opened because of the funding shortages. Since then, an additional 40 beds have been closed due to funding shortages.

During just the month of February 1989, an estimated 39 ambulances that normally would have come to the VAMC were turned away because of funding shortages. Veterans turned away must then pay for the medical care they receive at these other facilities.

Hours of nursing care per patient at the Portland VAMC are substantially below VA standards.

Because of the budget shortfalls, the Portland, VA is slated to cease treating 1,552 non-priority veterans.

Budget shortfalls have limited the number of joint replacement surgeries and open heart surgeries at the Portland Center.

The roots of the problem go back several years, when the Reagan administration said it could adequately care for the veterans' needs with fewer dollars. The cuts we are seeing today clearly show that the Reagan administration was not straight with the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we must take immediate action to correct these past mistakes. That is why I am supporting this supplemental appropriations bill which provides short-term emergency funding for VA medical centers nationwide. Also, I have written to the House Budget Committee to urge that it set appropriate budget levels to meet veterans' health care needs for fiscal year 1990 and beyond.

What is happening in Portland, OR, and at VA facilities around this country is not right. It is not fair. And it is not moral. Our Nation should not subject its veterans—in their greatest hours of need—to substandard health care. Nor should it be turning away veterans who by serving their country earned the right to receive that medical care.

Mr. Chairman, veterans need our assistance immediately. Consequently, I urge my colleagues to show their support by passing this critical legislation today.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2072, the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989. This measure contains urgently needed funding for a number of important national programs, including guaranteed student loans, foster care, redress payments for Japanese-Americans who were interned during World War II, and initiatives to address two of our most serious national problems, the drug crisis and the housing shortage.

Last year Congress took aggressive action to counter the rising drug epidemic by passing the Omnibus Drug Initiatives Act of 1988. Now that we have established a framework for a national drug intervention strategy, we must act to ensure that the necessary programs are adequately funded.

This supplemental appropriations bill includes \$822 million to fund antidrug law enforcement programs. This funding is essential. Nationwide we lost 11,000 people to drugs and drug related crime in 1987 alone. In that same year Americans spent an estimated \$140 billion to purchase illicit narcotics. In San Francisco in 1988, police recorded 55 drug gang shooting incidents, leaving 64 injured and 3 dead.

We now must pursue increased funding for programs for prevention, education, treatment, and rehabilitation. In my district of San Francisco, the wait to receive treatment can be 6 months. People are being turned away when they seek out help. Our hospitals are experiencing an alarming increase in the number of babies born with drug-related complications. In addition to funding antidrug law-enforcement efforts, we must work to address the human costs of this crisis.

This supplemental appropriations bill takes important steps to address the human costs of homelessness. The \$153.5 million for homeless programs will give a much-needed boost to homeless people and to advocates struggling to provide services to the homeless. The programs receiving funding through this bill—including VA medical care for homeless veterans, HUD's Single-Room Occupancy Program, the Emergency Shelter Grants Program, the Transitional and Supportive Housing Demonstration Program, and the Emergency Food and Shelter Program—all play vital roles in addressing the Nation's tragic homelessness problem. They are all programs with a record of success, and they are all in desperate need of funding.

While none of us would dispute the necessity of addressing the budget deficit, it is time that we took action to address the social action deficit which has done so much damage to programs assisting the less fortunate among us. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2072.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2072, the dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989. Except for the funding needs of veterans programs and drug interdiction efforts, there is no dire emergency, and this bill will only put us into dire straits as we attempt to reduce our persistent budget deficits.

This bill violates the letter and spirit of the 1987 budget summit agreement, where congressional leaders agreed not to pursue supplemental bills except in the case of dire emergencies.

Unfortunately, the Appropriations Committee could not resist decorating this bill with expensive ornaments, which resulted in more than doubling the administration's request by adding on additional money for a host of Government agencies. The committee also refused to offset these increases with reductions in other areas, as Congress also agreed to do in the 1987 budget agreement.

Some of the proposed additions may well represent legitimate spending needs, but they should be considered under the normal appropriations process, not given a free ride on legislation that is needed to respond to true emergencies. In this regard, the much-needed and overdue funding of veterans health care,

pensions and disability assistance is being held hostage to the profligate spending habits of the big spenders. We owe our veterans better treatment than this.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the bill produced by the Appropriations Committee violates the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction plan, breaks our commitment to avoid unnecessary supplemental bills, and flies in the face of the bipartisan budget agreement worked out between the administration and congressional leaders just last week. Because these violations threaten the legitimate needs of veterans and drug interdiction, the bill is highly irresponsible. We must get our budgetary house in order, but this bill simply increases the mess.

Ms. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, the supplemental appropriations bill we are considering today contains needed additions to a number of very important Federal programs. As a strong supporter of housing, veterans, refugee assistance—indeed, the majority of the programs included in this package—I am distressed at the manner in which this debate has developed. At the last minute, we are faced with an across-the-board funding cut to pay for additions to these programs. By taking this route, we indiscriminately rob Peter to pay Paul. An across-the-board cut gives us no opportunity to examine the impact on the individual programs. We place education, science funding, transportation, defense, and health care in the same basket. We abdicate the responsibility that is central to making a budget—setting priorities.

The original supplemental proposed by the administration represents a restrained package of funding that is absolutely needed. The committee package added a number of additional categories for funding, but it failed to provide a way to pay for these. If we cannot decide on a funding mechanism, then we cannot afford the spending.

Mr. Chairman, the package before us is an irresponsible approach to providing additional funding for very important programs. I support the programs, but I must vote against the irresponsible manner in which this supplemental appropriation has been brought to the floor. This bill should be sent back to the committee so that priorities can be set and we can consider a carefully deliberated package of funding increases and how we will pay for them. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2072, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1989.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call my colleagues' attention to one important and timely aspect of this bill, which is the additional \$100 million funding to be provided for migration and refugee assistance. This money will allow a substantially greater number of Soviet, East European, American, and Asian refugees to emigrate to this country.

As many of us know, the Soviet emigration movement—spurred by both outside pressure on the Soviets as well as by internal Soviet reforms—has been so successful that we have been facing problems which would have seemed inconceivable even 2 years ago: How to deal with the ever-increasing influx of Soviet emigres into this country.

Certainly, the thousands of Soviet Jews who have already emigrated and who will likely emigrate in the months ahead are reason for

celebration. And yet, as we have seen, the U.S. Government was—and is—unprepared for these numbers.

The Soviet Jewish refugee backlog in Rome is the most obvious manifestation of our Government's inability to cope with this problem. It is certainly ironic, Mr. Chairman, that at a time when the gates in the U.S.S.R. are finally opening, those in the United States are tightening.

What is most disturbing is that the INS has reportedly denied Soviet emigres refugee status because they supposedly lack "a well-founded fear of persecution." And yet, all Jews in the U.S.S.R. suffer anti-Semitic harassment. Regrettably, the entire episode has given the Soviets a public relations bonanza.

Apparently, one of the reasons for the denial of refugee status has been the simply unavailability of funds to resettle these Soviet Jews in America—as refugees—with all the benefits such status entails. Today's appropriation, when added to amounts already appropriated, will allow 24,500 more Soviet refugees to enter the United States than are presently provided for in fiscal year 1989 funding.

Such a step is long overdue, and underscores that the United States—true to its proud history—remains a haven for the oppressed and a shining example of freedom.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2072, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1989, and in opposition to Mr. CONTE's amendment. As an original cosponsor of H.R. 442 in the 100th Congress, the Civil Liberties Act of 1987, I want to emphasize my strong support for the \$250 million provided in H.R. 2072 for payments to World War II Japanese-American internees.

In February 1942, 2 months after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, some 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry were evacuated from the west coast of the United States, without trial by jury or due process of law, and confined to detention camps in desolate areas. Undertaken ostensibly for reasons of military security, this policy of evacuation and internment was carried out despite the fact that no American of Japanese ancestry was ever charged or convicted of any acts of treason or disloyalty.

The financial and emotional losses suffered by these individuals and their families were staggering. The \$250 million provided for in H.R. 2072 is essential toward fulfilling the goal of the Civil Liberties Act to compensate in a very belated manner for one of the darker periods of our Nation's history. I urge my colleagues to support this essential funding for the Civil Liberties Act of 1987.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my deep concern over the legislation before us. I continue to be amazed at the type of spending measures this body puts forward. While I am not a member of the Budget or Appropriations Committees, I can see clearly how much money this legislation is spending beyond last year's budget agreement. The bill clearly violates that agreement.

With a public debt approaching \$3 trillion, and annual deficits still hovering around \$100 million—even within the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings targets—we cannot continue to spend beyond our means in such a way. In passing this legislation, the House is saying that we

can afford to spend an additional \$1.3 billion beyond our deficit limit for 1989 alone, not to mention the additional millions being spent over the budget in the outyears.

It is not easy for me to oppose this measure as a whole. There are provisions of this legislation I am supportive of. For example, I would very much like to see the additional funds for veterans services enacted. I know how badly this money is needed. Due to shortfalls in funding and higher than anticipated case-loads, many veterans are either receiving care that is less than adequate or no care at all.

This is a sad and disgraceful way to repay the millions of men and women who risked their safety and lives, endured extreme stress, pain and anguish in the name of duty. Veterans across the country are feeling confused, angry, and betrayed and I can't blame them. I truly regret that the legitimate and worthy needs of veterans are held hostage to a few bloated, unnecessary and unbudgeted requests. If we had the best interests of America's veterans in mind we would be considering a clean piece of legislation that was not loaded down with over \$4.7 billion in funds.

In a similar vein, there are other programs included in this measure of which I am very supportive. An example of this is increased funding for antidrug programs. The evidence is abundant that drugs are quite possibly the worst and most pervasive social ill of our time. I am prepared to do what I can to combat drugs and help America's young people on the road to thoughtful and clear-headed leadership for the future. However, I cannot support the many other budget-busting provisions which are wrapped around these initiatives. Therefore, it is my view that while I do so with regret for the veterans and antidrug programs, I cannot support H.R. 2072. I hope this body will act wisely by rejecting this bill and bringing us back a more realistic measure.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, it is an outrage that veterans are held hostage to an attempt by Democrats to front-load 1990 spending in this supplemental appropriations bill. What even gets my temper up even higher is the underhanded attempt to sneak Japanese-American reparations in a bill designed, in part, to provide relief for United States veterans.

President Bush requested a \$2.1 billion supplemental appropriation to honor previous obligations mandated by law. The bulk of the President's request was targeted on veteran's benefits, adequate funding for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, and payments to States for foster care and adoption assistance.

The big spenders are now treating this supplemental as a political football, to see how much the President will tolerate in lard and pork. Every Member in this body has talked about the need to control the Federal deficit. Yet, this supplemental is double the President's request. The Democrats have ballooned the administration's supplemental request to \$4.7 billion.

My anger is up. When the hell are we going to control spending and rising interest rates? If this bill passes the House, it should be good for another point or two increase in interest rates.

What kind of signal does this send to the Nation if Congress can't even control its voracious appetite for spending? Fears of renewed inflation rock this Nation. Fears of increasing interest rates and job loss are pressing on the minds of many Americans. Simply put, Mr. Chairman, this bill is destabilizing for our economic future.

It is also simply outrageous to blackmail veteran's health care funding by attaching \$250 million for Japanese-American reparations to this supplemental bill. Last year, I told my constituents that I would not support funding for reparations, especially when veterans have to beg and grovel to receive the Federal benefits they have earned with their blood and sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, let's put action behind our words and defeat attempts to add nonemergency spending to the supplemental appropriations bill. Let's put an end to pork, and vote on a real emergency supplemental that will resolve the funding crisis in the Veteran's Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in House Report 101-37, which shall be considered in the order specified, shall be offered only by the Member specified, or his designee, and shall be considered as having been read. Said amendments are debatable for 60 minutes each, equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment, or his designee, and a Member opposed thereto, and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2072

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide dire emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes, namely:

CONTENTS OF BILL

Title I—Dire Emergency Supplementals and Transfers:

Chapter I—Emergency Drug Funding:

Subchapter A—Commerce-Justice-State.

Subchapter B—Treasury-Postal Service.

Chapter II—Judicial Retirement Fund.

Chapter III—Corps of Engineers, Civil.

Energy Programs.

Chapter IV—Migration and Refugee Assistance.

International Peacekeeping Activities.

Chapter V—Forest Firefighting.

Naval Petroleum Reserve Limitation.

Chapter VI—Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Foster Care and Adoption Assistance.

Rehabilitation Services and Handicapped Research.

Guaranteed Student Loans.

Prescription Drug Payment Review Commission.

Chapter VII—Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress.

Chapter VIII—Agricultural Marketing Service.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.

Chapter IX—Federal Aviation Administration.

Installation and Use of Explosive Detection Equipment.

Chapter X—Department of the Treasury.

IRS—Processing Tax Returns.

IRS—Investigation, Collection, and Taxpayer Service.

Chapter XI—VA Compensation and Pensions.

VA Readjustment Benefits.

VA Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund.

VA Medical Care.

Court of Veterans Appeals.

Homeless Programs.

EPA, Salaries and Expenses.

EPA, Abatement, Control, and Compliance.

EPA, Hazardous Substance Superfund.

NASA, Research and Program Management.

Title II—Urgent Supplemental Appropriations:

Chapter I—NOAA, Operations, Research, and Facilities.

Department of Justice, Legal Activities.

United States Attorneys Salaries and Expenses.

Japanese Internment Fund.

FBI, Salaries and Expenses.

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Salaries and Expenses.

Defender Services.

Administrative Office of United States Courts.

Federal Judicial Center, Salaries and Expenses.

Maritime Administration, Federal Ship Financing Fund.

FCC, Salaries and Expenses.

SEC, Salaries and Expenses.

Chapter II—Department of Defense, Administrative Provisions.

Chapter III—Department of the Interior and Related Agencies—General Provisions.

Chapter IV—FAA, Aircraft Purchase Loan Guarantee.

Chapter V—OPM, Salaries and Expenses.

Chapter VI—Housing Programs, Rental Assistance.

Community Development Grants.

NSF, Research and Related Activities.

Title III—Technical Enrollment Corrections.

Title IV—General Provisions.

TITLE I—DISASTER EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND TRANSFERS CHAPTER I—EMERGENCY DRUG FUNDING

SUBCHAPTER A

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For an additional amount for the Department of Justice, \$588,139,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding any designations contained in titles I through IX of Public Law 100-690: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, \$125,000,000 shall be made available only for the drug-related projects of the Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Program authorized in section 6091 of Public Law 100-690.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$4,000,000, to remain avail-

able until expended, for expenses authorized by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 for development, procurement, and implementation of a machine-readable travel and identity document border security program.

THE JUDICIARY

For an additional amount for the Judiciary, \$129,420,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding any designations contained in titles I through IX of Public Law 100-690.

RELATED AGENCY

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for the State Justice Institute, \$4,020,000, to remain available until expended.

SUBCHAPTER B

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$4,000,000.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$35,000,000, of which \$7,000,000 shall be available for development, procurement, and implementation of a machine-readable travel and identity document border security program.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR INTERDICTION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Interdiction Program", \$51,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, \$6,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available only to accommodate the advanced in-service training requirements of the Drug Enforcement Administration that cannot otherwise be met at the Department of Justice training facilities, and \$2,000,000 shall be available to increase the level of drug enforcement training for Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers.

CHAPTER II

THE JUDICIARY

JUDICIAL RETIREMENT FUNDS

PAYMENT TO JUDICIAL OFFICERS' RETIREMENT FUND

For payment to the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund, as authorized by Public Law 100-659, \$2,300,000.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1989, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law as follows:

"General regulatory functions", \$1,100,000, to be derived by transfer from "Operation and maintenance, general".

"General expenses", \$2,600,000, to be derived by transfer from "Construction, general".

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for uranium supply and enrichment activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), \$55,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That revenues received by the Department for the enrichment of uranium and estimated to total \$1,429,000,000 in fiscal year 1989, shall be retained and used for the specific purpose of offsetting costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment service activities as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302(b) of section 484 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as uranium enrichment revenues are received during fiscal year 1989 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1989 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Sunset Harbor, California: Section 1119(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The total cost referred to in the preceding sentence may be increased by the Secretary by any amount contributed by non-Federal interests which is in excess of amounts contributed by non-Federal interests under the preceding sentence."

SEC. 302. Exchange of Federal Land: Subsection 1. Exchange of Federal Public Land.

(a) EXCHANGE OF LAND.—Subject to subsection 2, at such time as the Blue Tee Corporation transfers all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in subsection 1(b)(1) to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary shall transfer all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in subsection 1(b)(2) to the Blue Tee Corporation.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—35.03 acres of land located in Madison County, Illinois, known as Government Tract Number 121 and owned by the Blue Tee Corporation.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—58.64 acres situated in Madison County, Illinois, known as Government Tract Number 122 and administered by the United States Army Corp of Engineers, which is constructing the Melvin Price Lock and Dam Project on this land.

Subsection 2. Conditions of exchange.

The exchange of land authorized by subsection 1 shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) DEEDS.—

(A) FEDERAL LAND.—The instrument of conveyance used to convey the land described in subsection 1(b)(2) to the Blue Tee Corporation shall contain such reservations, terms, and conditions as the Secretary of the Army considers necessary to allow the United States to construct, operate, and maintain the Melvin Price Lock on that land.

(B) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The conveyance of the land described in subsection 1(b)(1) to the Secretary of the Army shall be by a warranty deed acceptable to the Secretary.

(2) REMOVAL OF IMPROVEMENTS.—The Blue Tee Corporation may reserve the right to remove any improvements on the land described in subsection 1(b)(1) belonging to them. The terms of such reservation shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of

the Army. The Blue Tee Corporation shall hold the United States harmless from liability, and the United States shall not incur any cost, associated with the removal or relocation of such improvements.

(3) **TIME LIMIT FOR EXCHANGE.**—The land exchange authorized by subsection 1(a) must be completed within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) **LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—The Secretary shall provide the legal description of the lands described in subsection 1(b). That legal description shall be used in the instruments of conveyance of such lands.

SEC. 303. Saylorville Lake, Iowa: From Construction, General funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, the Secretary of the Army is directed to construct Highway 415, Segment "C" at the Saylorville Lake, Iowa, Project in accordance with terms of the Relocations Contract executed on June 21, 1984, between the Rock Island District Engineer and the State of Iowa.

SEC. 304. Sims Park, Ohio: The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall undertake a beach erosion control project at Sims Park, Euclid, Ohio, using funds appropriated under the heading "CONSTRUCTION GENERAL" in title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation, 1988 (Public Law 100-202; 101 Stat. 107).

CHAPTER IV

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

Of the funds appropriated in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1989, up to \$200,000 of the unearmarked funds appropriated under the heading "Economic Support Fund" may be made available for the support of the electoral process in Poland, which may include, among other things, support for international observer missions and civic education programs: *Provided*, That, funds made available under this paragraph may be used without regard to any provision of law which would otherwise prohibit the use of foreign assistance funds with respect to Poland.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Migration and refugee assistance", \$100,000,000, to support emergency refugee admissions and assistance: *Provided*, That this amount may be derived through new budget authority, or the President may transfer to such account for purposes of this paragraph any unobligated and unearmarked funds made available under Public Law 100-461, notwithstanding section 514 as amended by section 589 of Public Law 100-461: *Provided further*, That if the President transfers funds for this paragraph not more than 3.3 per centum of the unobligated and unearmarked funds available under any account in Public Law 100-461 may be transferred: *Provided further*, That any transfer of funds pursuant to this paragraph shall be subject to the regular reprogramming procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That not less than \$85,000,000 of such amount shall be made available for Soviet and other Eastern European Refugee admissions and for admissions restored to other regions: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this paragraph are available until expended.

INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1. In order to meet urgent requests that may arise during fiscal year 1989 for contributions and other assistance for new international peacekeeping activities, and to reimburse funds originally appropriated for prior international peacekeeping activities, which have been reprogrammed for new international peacekeeping activities, the President may transfer during fiscal year 1989 such of the funds described in section 2(a) as the President deems necessary, but not to exceed \$125,000,000 to the "CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES" account or the "PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS" account administered by the Department of State, notwithstanding section 15(a) of the Department of State Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 10 of Public Law 91-672, or any other provision of law.

SEC. 2. (a) **IN GENERAL.**—The funds that may be transferred under the authority of this heading for use in accordance with section 1 are—

(1) any funds available to the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1989, other than funds appropriated by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-463); and

(2) any funds appropriated by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-461) for the "MILITARY ASSISTANCE" account, for the "INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING" account, or for grants under the "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM" account.

(b) **RELATIONSHIP TO CERTAIN OTHER PROVISIONS.**—Funds described in subsection (a)(2) may be transferred and used for contributions or other assistance for new international peacekeeping activities in accordance with section 1 of this provision notwithstanding section 514 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1989 (as amended by section 589 of that Act), relating to transfers between accounts.

SEC. 3. (a) **REVIEW OF PROPOSED TRANSFERS.**—Any transfer of funds pursuant to section 1 shall be subject to the regular reprogramming procedures of the following committees:

(1) The Committee on Appropriations of each House of Congress.

(2) The Committee on Armed Services of each House of Congress if funds described in paragraph (1) of section 2(a) are to be transferred.

(3) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate if funds described in paragraph (2) of section 2(a) are to be transferred.

(b) **REVIEW OF PROPOSED OBLIGATIONS.**—The regular reprogramming procedures of the following committees shall apply with respect to the obligation of any funds transferred pursuant to section 1:

(1) The Committee on Appropriations of each House of Congress.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For an additional amount for emergency rehabilitation, forest firefighting, fire severity suppression, and other emergency costs on National Forest System lands and

Department of Interior lands, \$599,669,000 of which (1) \$30,180,000 is for "Bureau of Land Management, Management of lands and resources"; (2) \$2,895,000 is for "United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource management"; (3) \$25,000,000 is for "National Park Service, Operation of the National Park System"; (4) \$33,594,000 is for "Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian Programs"; and (5) \$508,000,000 is for "Forest Service, National Forest System": *Provided*, That such funds are to be available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were transferred in fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988 for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No funds appropriated or made available, heretofore or hereafter, under this or any other Act may be used by the executive branch for soliciting proposals, or performing studies designed to aid in or achieve the transfer out of Federal ownership, management or control by sale, lease, or other disposition, in whole or in part, the facilities and functions of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (Elk Hills), located in Kern County, California, established by Executive order of the President, dated September 2, 1912, and Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3 (Teapot Dome), located in Wyoming, established by Executive order of the President, dated April 30, 1915, unless and until legislation specifically authorizing such activities or such transfer out of Federal ownership of the aforesaid Naval Petroleum Reserves is enacted and specific provision for such activities is made in an appropriations Act.

SEC. 502. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 1989 and thereafter, sums provided by any party, including sums provided in advance as (1) reimbursement for contingency planning, response or damage assessment or response activities conducted or to be conducted by any agency funded in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act as a result of any discharge of oil into the environment or (2) damages for injuries resulting from such a discharge to resources for which an agency funded in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act is a trustee, may be credited to the relevant appropriation for that agency then current and shall be available until expended: *Provided*, That section 102 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989, is amended as follows: after the term "volcanoes"; insert "for contingency planning subsequent to actual oil spills, response and natural resource damage assessment activities related to oil spills."

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Federal Unemployment Benefits and Allowances", \$126,648,000, of which \$92,000,000 shall be for activities as provided by part 1, subchapter B, chapter 2, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, and \$34,648,000 shall be for activities, including necessary related administrative expenses, as authorized by sections 236, 237, and 238 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The last proviso under this heading in Public Law 100-436, related to automatic data processing and telecommunications expenditures, is deleted.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Payments to States for Foster Care and Adoption Assistance", \$423,345,000 for title IV-E of the Social Security Act, which shall be available for prior years' claims.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND HANDICAPPED RESEARCH

Allotments under sections 100(b)(1) and 110(b)(3) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 in the amount of \$1,450,000,000 shall be considered as funds mandated by law for purposes of applying section 517 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

For payment of obligations under this heading incurred during fiscal year 1989, \$892,428,000.

RELATED AGENCY

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PAYMENT REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Prescription Drug Payment Review Commission, as authorized by section 1847 of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, \$250,000, to be derived by transfer of \$125,000 from the Physician Payment Review Commission and \$125,000 from the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Carolyn F. Nichols, widow of Bill Nichols, late a Representative from the State of Alabama, \$89,500.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed an additional \$2,500,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for necessary administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service incurred in carrying out fiscal year 1989 workload in connection with 1988 disaster assistance activities only, not to exceed \$40,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND

OPERATING LOANS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for insured operating loans, \$75,000,000, to be derived by transfer from guaranteed operating loans.

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Operations", \$70,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 1990, of which not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be available for a pay demonstration project in the Chicago area, and of which \$35,000,000 shall be available only for the hiring of additional aviation security specialists, aviation safety inspectors, and air traffic controllers.

INSTALLATION AND USE OF EXPLOSIVE DETECTION EQUIPMENT

Not later than fifteen days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Aviation Administrator shall initiate action, including such rulemaking or other actions as necessary, to require air carriers to use explosive detection equipment that meets minimum performance standards requiring application of technology equivalent to or better than thermal neutron analysis technology at such airports (whether located within or outside the United States) as the Administrator determines that the installation and use of such equipment is necessary to ensure the safety of air carrier passengers. The Administrator shall complete these actions within ninety days of enactment of this Act.

STATE AND LOCAL ANTI-APARTHEID POLICIES

Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, none of the funds provided by this or any previous Act to the Department of Transportation shall be withheld from State or local grantees for any reason related to the adoption by any such grantee of a policy prohibiting the procurement of products manufactured or fabricated in the Republic of South Africa.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "International affairs", not to exceed \$2,063,000, to be derived by transfer from "Salaries and expenses".

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Under this heading in the Treasury Department Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-440), and notwithstanding section 103 of such Act, an additional \$5,500,000 may be transferred to the Financial Management Service, "Salaries and expenses" for the sole purpose of funding fiscal year 1989 postage costs that exceed the savings generated by administrative actions of the Financial Management Service.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

PROCESSING TAX RETURNS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Processing tax returns", \$32,229,000, to be derived by transfer from "Examinations and appeals".

INVESTIGATION, COLLECTION, AND TAXPAYER SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Investigation, collection, and taxpayer service", \$41,754,000, to be derived by transfer from "Examinations and appeals".

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$701,481,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", \$22,212,000, to remain available until expended.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for "Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund", \$120,100,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HEALTH SERVICE AND RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$340,125,000: *Provided*, That of the sums appropriated under this heading in fiscal year 1989, not less than \$6,800,000,000 shall be available only for expenses in the personnel compensation and benefits object classifications.

For an additional amount for "Medical care", as authorized by the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988, \$30,000,000.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$24,900,000, of which \$15,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Construction, minor projects": *Provided*, That in the appropriation language under this heading in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989, insert a period after "\$774,316,000" and delete the language that follows.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING

For an additional amount for "Annual contributions for assisted housing", \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount of budget authority is to be used only to assist homeless individuals under section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act.

PAYMENTS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

For an additional amount for "Payments for operation of low-income housing projects", \$88,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1990: *Provided*, That from the foregoing amount, \$8,000,000 shall be made available, notwithstanding section 9(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, for increased security assistance.

EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Emergency shelter grants program", \$73,500,000, to remain available until expended.

TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Transitional and supportive housing demonstration program", \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR FACILITIES TO ASSIST THE HOMELESS

For grants for supplemental assistance for facilities to assist the homeless as authorized under subtitle D of title V of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$3,490,000, to be derived by transfer from "Urban development action grants".

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Section 17(f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437o(f)) is amended—

- (1) by inserting after "State of New York" the following: "or City of New York"; and
- (2) in clause (1), by inserting "or municipal" after "State".

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the initial startup costs and operation of the Court of Veterans Appeals as authorized by sections 4051-4091 of title 38, United States Code, \$3,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 1990.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$6,000,000.

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

For an additional amount for "Abatement, control, and compliance", \$9,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1990.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND (RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$15,000,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the "Emergency food and shelter program", \$15,000,000.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Research and program management", up to \$15,000,000, of which up to \$10,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Research and development" and up to \$5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Space flight, control and data communications".

TITLE II—URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Operations, research, and facilities", \$32,200,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, General Legal Activities", \$7,700,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys", \$12,476,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL LIBERTIES PUBLIC EDUCATION FUND

For payments to eligible individuals as authorized by sections 105 and 106 of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-383), \$250,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$23,010,000, to remain available until expended.

THE JUDICIARY

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENDER SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Defender services", \$6,750,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$50,000.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$440,000, to remain available until expended.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL SHIP FINANCING FUND

For payment to the Secretary of Treasury for debt reduction, \$515,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$500,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$18,285,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISION

Funds appropriated to the Commission for the Study of International Migration and Cooperative Economic Development and the Commission on Agricultural Workers in Public Law 100-459 shall remain available until expended.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE— MILITARY

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Section 8111 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-463; 102 Stat. 2270-38) is amended by striking out "\$1,163,200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,258,600,000".

SEC. 202. Section 8119 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-463; 102 Stat. 40) is repealed.

SEC. 203. Section 8080 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-463) is amended by inserting the following provision at the end of the paragraph, after "skills": "Provided further, That these limitations shall not apply to members who enlist in the armed services on or after July 1, 1989, under a fifteen-month program established by the Secretary of Defense to test the cost-effective use of special recruiting incentives involving not more than nineteen noncombat arms skills approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense".

SEC. 204. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may adjust wage rates for civilian employees hired for certain health care occupations as authorized for the Administrator of the Veterans Affairs by section 4107(g) of title 38, United States Code: *Provided*, That only those occupations cited in the July 5, 1988, report submitted by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs shall be covered by this provision.

SEC. 205. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended for research, development, test, evaluation, production, deployment, or operation of the Mid-Infrared Advanced Chemical Laser/SEALITE Beam Director.

(b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to the extent that (1) the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a description of proposed funding during the current fiscal year for the Mid-Infrared Advanced Chemical Laser/SEALITE Beam Director (including the amount and the source of such funding), and (2) such funding is treated in accordance with procedures applicable to programs which have been designated as items of congressional interest.

(c) The limitation in subsection (a) does not apply with respect to the obligation or expenditure of funds for expenses required for the termination of a contract.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. None of the funds available to the Department of the Interior may be used to place on the National Register of Historic Places the Al Capone House at 7244 South Prairie Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

SEC. 302. The King Center and the National Park Service are authorized to locate an additional parking site for the Martin Luther King National Historic Site within the National Historic Site and Preservation District Boundary in accordance with Federal and State preservation regulations, in lieu of the vacant lot on the north side of Irwin between Jackson and Boulevard as specified in Public Law 100-202.

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

AIRCRAFT PURCHASE LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

For the settlement of promissory notes issued to the Secretary of the Treasury, \$10,770,941, to remain available until expended, together with such sums as may be necessary for the payment of interest due under the terms and conditions of such notes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Section 312 of Public Law 100-457 is amended by deleting "\$276,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300,000".

SEC. 302. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the New York State Bridge Authority shall have the authority to collect tolls on the Newburgh-Beacon Bridge and to utilize the revenue therefrom for the construction and reconstruction of and for the costs necessary for the proper maintenance and operation of any bridges and facilities under the jurisdiction of such Authority and for the payment of debt service on any of the Authority's obligations issued in connection therewith.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Funds appropriated under this heading in the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1989, Public Law 100-440, for construction of barriers at the south end of the White House shall remain available until expended.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCY

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amounts made available under this heading in the Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-440), which are to be transferred from the Trust Funds for implementing the recordkeeping system of the Federal Employees' Retirement System, shall remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may adjust wage rates for civilian employees hired for certain health care occupations as authorized for the Administrator of the Veterans Affairs by section 4107(g) of title 38, United States Code.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Such sums as may be necessary are hereby approved to implement the authority conferred on the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by section 236(r) of the National Housing Act to provide interest reductions and rental assistance payments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the second sentence of such section 236(r), an application shall be eligible for assistance under such section if the mortgagee submits an application within five hundred and forty-eight days after the effective date of this Act.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Funds under this head in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989 shall be made available for a special project under section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307) to the Hawaii State Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, for infrastructure development on Hawaiian Home Lands, notwithstanding the restrictions on alienation applicable to such lands.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

The limitation carried under this heading in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989 on program development and management in fiscal year 1989 is increased by \$750,000.

GENERAL PROVISION

Section 406 under this heading in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-404) is amended by striking out "the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, who, under title 5, United States Code, section 101, is exempted from such limitation" and inserting in lieu thereof "any officer or employee authorized such transportation under title 31, United States Code, section 1344".

GENERAL PROVISION—TITLE II

Funds provided in this title shall become available for obligation or expenditure, only (1) upon agreement by House and Senate conferees to a reduction of existing funds to offset such expenditure, or (2) additional receipts to the Treasury to offset such expenditures are made.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ENROLLMENT
CORRECTIONS

SEC. 301. The appropriation Operation and Maintenance, Navy as contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-463; 102 Stat. 2270-3) is amended by striking out ", of which \$60,000,000 shall be transferred to the Coast Guard".

SEC. 302. In Public Law 100-461, "An Act making appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes", in TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS, following the last "." in section 572, insert the following:

"RESOLUTION OF JAPANESE BEETLE PROBLEM"

"SEC. 573. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to fund any programs to assist in solving the Japanese beetle problem in the Azores. It is the sense of the Congress that this problem was created by the Department of Defense which should fund any program to resolve it."

SEC. 303. In Public Law 100-446, "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes", in the account titled "Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission" delete the sum "\$27,323,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$27,373,000".

SEC. 304. In Public Law 100-460, "An Act making appropriations for Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes", in the account titled "National Agricultural Library",

delete the sum "\$13,268,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,268,000".

SEC. 305. In Public Law 100-457, "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes", in the account titled "Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Interstate Transfer Grants-Transit" delete the sum "\$2,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000,000".

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 402. Notwithstanding section 1346 of title 31, United States Code, or section 608 of Public Law 100-440, funds made available for fiscal year 1989 by this or any other Act shall be available for the interagency funding of national security and emergency preparedness telecommunications initiatives which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities, as provided by Executive Order Numbered 12472 (April 3, 1984).

This Act may be cited as the "Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Transfers, Urgent Supplementals, and Correcting Enrollment Errors Act of 1989".

MR. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the bill?

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order against section 204 on page 31 of the bill, and also I rise to make a point of order against the language contained in lines 20 through 25 on page 34 of the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan may be heard on his point of order.

MR. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve a point of order so that I can have a colloquy with him?

THE CHAIRMAN. Points of order have to be made, and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania may discuss the point or order. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

MR. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman to explain the problems that we have in the military with nurses. I know we have talked about this a couple of times before. For 2 years I have been visiting the naval hospitals and they have a tremendous shortage of personnel, as the gentleman knows, not only in nurses, but in anesthetists, and in a number of other professions, not jobs, in the medical services of the Navy.

We put 800 people in 1 year ago and specified that they could only go to the medical services. We are spending

money for CHAMPUS right now, money that should go to the hospitals so that they could take care of the patient much more efficiently, in the way naval personnel expect them to be taken care of.

□ 1340

The dependents are the ones that are suffering because of the provision where they cannot get the nurses. There is such a competition for nurses and they are underpaid and what we have asked in this legislation is that the individual services would be able to contract at a higher price in individual cases at those hospitals to alleviate this shortage we have in the military.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized to state his point of order.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the ground that the language in both instances constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill violating clause 2 of rule XXI.

I would like to say for the record in response to the gentleman that I understand and, to some degree, sympathize with what he is trying to do with his legislating in this appropriations bill. But frankly he is causing us a problem.

My committee has been working now for almost 3 years and the subcommittee, both Democrats and Republicans, have been trying to develop a comprehensive revision of the Federal pay system just because of instances as the gentleman is describing. He can talk about nurses in the military hospitals but I have to tell you that we get what is left over in our veterans hospitals. In most States our veterans hospitals are so understaffed in the nurse-patient ratio that if they were not operated by the Federal Government they would not be licensed by the States. It is a scandal waiting to explode in our face.

We spent a good part of 1988 negotiating with Mr. Reagan's Office of Personnel Management about some solutions for this. It came apart when we found they were interested only in dealing with the Defense Department and not with NASA, not with any of the other agencies where we have similar problems.

It is our hope that by not letting those cases that have come to people's attention and have become popular get away, that we will be able to do a comprehensive job of relating the Federal pay system more realistically to the kinds of skills that are required for the jobs and the kind of competition we face in the private sector in trying to find the people.

We not only cannot get nurses, we cannot get doctors.

As I stand here talking to you there is no director of research at the National Institutes of Health. If you read

the paper yesterday, we lost more of the top people at NASA.

We had testimony last week from the Volcker Commission which has a comprehensive plan for taking care of this. We will hear testimony from the former director of NASA and other personnel directors in a few days.

Very shortly the Chief Justice of the United States for the first time in history will appear before our committee to talk about the judges. We are hoping to get all these people working together so there will be support for a comprehensive rewrite of our pay system.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Michigan. I do understand it. I know he has been working on it. I just wanted to say to him we do have an emergency and I hope his legislation will move quickly forward.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. To help the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, most of what he wants to do the Office of Personnel Management has the authority to do now. And for whatever reason the administration chooses not to agree with the Secretary of Defense on doing it. I think maybe if they could resolve their differences they could accomplish a good deal of what the gentleman is asking for.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GLICKMAN). Are there further Members who wish to be heard on this point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

For the reasons stated by the gentleman from Michigan in connection with these two sections that a point of order is raised upon, the Chair finds that these sections are in fact legislation on an appropriations bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order reluctantly that the provision beginning on page 20, line 19 and ending on page 21, line 6 constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and is a violation of clause 2, rule XXI of the rules of the House of Representatives.

I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I said "reluctantly" because I fully concur with the language, and the intent of the Committee on Appropriations in directing action to be taken on installation of explosives detection devices at key domestic and overseas airports at which U.S. air carriers operate.

However, the Subcommittee on Aviation, which I chair, has concluded hearings and will tomorrow, I am confident, report out a bill to provide in an orderly fashion a legislative framework within which this work will be done and which will also provide a funding mechanism that will be within

the ambit of the Appropriations Committee.

We anticipate bringing such legislation through the full committee the following week and to the House floor as expeditiously as House leadership can do so.

We have reached a bipartisan agreement within our committee on the framework for this legislation.

The Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee has, in fact, taken the language from the pending bill before our committee and very commendably demonstrated its genuine concern and seized upon this opportunity to act quickly, demonstrate its commitment to protection of Americans traveling in air carriers vulnerable to terrorism.

So I commend the committee and commend the chairman for his desire to use the authority of the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations to deal with terrorism.

I merely am saying defer until our committee has created the legislative framework within which the appropriate funding may be provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] for further debate on the point of order.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the position of my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR]. Nevertheless, I am sorry that a point of order was made against this provision. The real reason that our subcommittee added this provision was to move as quickly as possible to give the manufacturers the strongest possible signal to gear up as fast as possible to mass produce these devices. This will allow them to produce 50 to 100 of these machines a year instead of the 5 or 6 that they now have scheduled.

As the gentleman said, our provision does not really conflict with the provision that I understand is being now legislated in his subcommittee and in the full Committee on Public Works and Transportation. But we are just trying to, you could say, double track through appropriations to insure the most rapid possible deployment of these devices.

As many of us know, even with the best of intentions and the best possible true legislation, sometimes you get weighted down with the consequences and then it dies. For instance, in this case there is a possible conflict as to who is going to pay for these devices, whether the Federal Government or the taxpayers are going to do it or whether the airline industry is going to do it. This controversy could possibly sink this legislation in the authorizing process. I would just urge the gentleman to perhaps withdraw his objection and let us get on with the

fastest possible improvement for the safety of air travel.

I am really sorry that a point of order is being made against the provision in this bill that deals with explosive detection equipment.

I just hope that the gentleman is not placing jurisdictional turf ahead of the goal we all share to fast track state of the art bomb detection equipment.

The reason our subcommittee added this provision was to, as fast as possible, give manufacturers the strongest possible signal to gear up for mass production now. This will allow them to produce 50 to 100 machines per year—instead of the 6 per year now programmed.

Our provision does not conflict with what I understand is the substance of the authorizing committee legislation. We are just double tracking through appropriations to insure rapid deployment.

Too often legislation—good legislation—gets weighed down with controversy and dies—for instance in this case a provision that mandates the Federal Government—taxpayers—not the airlines to fund this program could sink this legislation.

I would urge the gentleman to withdraw his objection and let us get on with the fastest possible improvement for the safety of air travel.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further discussion on the point of order?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] is recognized.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to support Chairman LEHMAN's request that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, withdraw his point of order.

This is a way to proceed expeditiously and try to get something done here that is important.

I know the gentleman from Minnesota feels the same way and I hope that he might consider withdrawing his request as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further discussion on the point of order?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, again I appreciate the desire of the members of the subcommittee to move expeditiously. We will do so within the context of the legislation pending in the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. We will provide a framework to do all of those things that Chairman LEHMAN just addressed in an expeditious fashion but within the proper legislative framework. I think having a bipartisan understanding as we do, we will be able to move that legislation without the appendages that would weigh it down.

□ 1350

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GLICKMAN). The Chair is prepared to rule. For the reasons outlined by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the Chair finds that this language is, in fact, legislation on an appropriations

bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURTHA

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURTHA: On page 38, after line 25 insert the following:

No funds appropriated under this act or any other act shall be available to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms for the enforcement of section 204 of the Alcoholic Beverage Labeling Act of 1988, title VIII of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, (Pub. L. 100-690, 102 Stat. 481) and regulations issued thereunder, as it relates to malt beverage glass returnable bottles of 12 ounces or less to which labels have been permanently affixed by means of painting and heat treatment, which were ordered on or before April 21, 1989, provided the closure for such bottles contain the warning statement, and provided further, that any new returnable glass bottles ordered after April 21, 1989, will be in full compliance with section 204 and the regulations issued thereunder.

Mr. MURTHA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to find out what the amendment is about.

Mr. MURTHA. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, let me explain the amendment. This amendment takes care of a brewery that has a labeling problem, and it will take care of it for a couple of years because there are 800,000 cases of bottles already filled and this keeps them from going out of business during the next couple of years. The label provisions goes into effect in November and may need a couple of years.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does this have any fiscal implications?

Mr. MURTHA. No.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the amendment and had a visit with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and I have no objection to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while I have some serious reservations about H.R. 2072 because it does not comply with the budget accord, I would like to state my strong support for a program in chapter 4 of the bill, authorizing further migration and refugee assistance.

This chapter authorizes \$100 million to support emergency refugee assistance for Soviet and East European refugees as well as African and Asian Refugees. The money would be available only if new budget authority is obtained, or the President elects to transfer unobligated and unearmarked funds made available in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1989.

This money would allow for the admission of 24,500 more Soviet refugees in addition to the 19,000 already funded for fiscal year 1989.

I just returned from a week in the Soviet Union. I was last there in 1971, and the changes that have taken place are remarkable.

But in the area of emigration, much needs to be done. While more Soviets are being allowed to emigrate than in recent years, those requesting exit visas are still persecuted.

I was approached by a large group of Armenian refuseniks who asked me to publicize their plight and support further funding for refugee assistance.

This petition, written in broken but very compelling English, tells their story more eloquently than I can, and I include it at this point in the record.

The petition follows:

We, a group of Soviet citizens, have for a long time to get rid of Soviet citizenship—citizenship of the country where a single-party system and lawlessness reign.

It is a common knowledge that prior to Helsinki Declaration on Human Rights of 1975 any Soviet citizen openly proclaiming his wish to emigrate from the USSR could get into a sanitarium or finally be in circumstances under which he could lose a human face. The Helsinki Declaration imbued us with a belief that our dreams of many years would be fulfilled despite artificial difficulties created by the Soviet party/only next of kin relatives were permitted to emigrate. However in 1980 Soviet citizens were deprived of even these limited emigration rights.

We, having the belief and a great wish to get become free, nevertheless had not lost hopes; and indeed in 1987 emigration that was diligently assisted up to summer of 1988 by the American government which granted refugee status to 4700 families, started again. Such rate of emigration was suitable for us, but—the saying is that “a rapid stream becomes dry soon”—the emigration slowed down again this time to a considerable degree owing to the actions undertaken by the American government. In July 1988 emigrants were told that entry to the USA was being slowed down as the Emigration Fund assigned for that Fiscal Year had been depleted; and also a promise was given that starting from the next FY /01.10.88/ the emigration would continue. The next year had come but utterly new regulations for Soviet emigrants followed; the new regula-

tions equalized the unfortunate Soviet citizens with emigrants entering the USA from democratic countries; besides, these regulations were also applied to a big group of Soviet emigrants who had filed their documents to the US Consulate before these regulations had become adopted /before 01.10.88/. It should be particularly noted that these people having addressed to the US Consulate before 01.10.88 /for this purpose only one member of each family went to Moscow/, got leaflets that said that in order to be interviewed before going to the USA they are to be available having Soviet special passports issues to travel abroad. To get these passports they had to vacate their flats and homes, leave their jobs, take children out of educational institutions /including higher schools/, kindergartens, forgo medical service as they were to be excluded from patients lists at their polyclinics. The done so and afterwards together with their whole families including little children and old men and women went to Moscow and referred to the American Consulate where tidings about the altered emigration regulations were brought down on them.

As a result they instead of going to the USA in a week's time get stalled in Moscow for a period of uncertain duration and faced with a swarm of problems. It is impossible to get rooms in Moscow hotels, and private flats are leased by cooperatives at the price of 7 roubles per day for one person which is 7 times more expensive than in hotels, where previously rooms were booked by the US Consulate for Soviet emigrants. Now imagine a family of these emigrants consisting of 5 and more persons and staying in Moscow from October-November 1988.

In addition to the fact that they are harassed by local authorities under the pretext that they have no Moscow residence permit, provocations against them are arranged with the help of hooligan elements; and when emigrants refer to bodies of maintenance of public order, those, instead of stopping hooliganism, cavil at lack of the residence permit. To get medical service emigrants have to address to commercial outpatients' clinics; and the quality of medical services can be judged by the fact that already there are cases of death among the emigrants.

Particularly worrying is the plight of children and youths who are deprived of opportunity to continue their education. The fact is that we are to leave this country because we have rather sceptical attitude to this country, and we wouldn't like that such an attitude concerning the rest of the world evolve in minds of our children.

Whereas according to new regulations the main reason of delaying the emigrants is a lack of their sponsors, it is strange that The Consulate is not able to become aware of the fact that Soviet emigrants unlike emigrants from other countries have not the opportunity to take away their money due to the unconvertible nature of Soviet rouble, and further delaying issuance of entry visas will soon these emigrants into beggared vagrants at all.

Concluding any valid labour contracts on behalf of emigrants by their relatives in absence of future employees themselves, as the American Consulate hints thereat, is hardly possible too.

In conclusion we make a request. Have mercy on our youths' souls, have mercy on health of our old men and women. Help us to go; we do not intend to sustain our lives by alms. There are specialists of various kinds amongst us, and we're able to work

and to do good for the country where we shall live.

We are people living in the end of XXth century, when mankind struggles to save the Earth and to establish millennial ideals, we hope it will not be allowed that these 300 families become victims of the still going cold war.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, in H.R. 2072, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, there is a provision providing for the transfer of up to \$40 million from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for necessary administrative expenses incurred in carrying out fiscal year 1989 workload in connection with the 1988 disaster assistance activities. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the county office ASCS personnel for working long, hard hours in implementing the Disaster Assistance Act of 1988.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee responsible for this legislation, I would like to applaud my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations for highlighting one of the problems encountered with USDA's implementation of the Emergency Assistance Act of 1988. In addition, I want to ensure that USDA understands that this is a problem not only with beans, edible beans, but a problem that has been encountered by farmers who produce pumpkins, peaches, apples, melons, onions, and cantaloupes, to name just a few.

It was not the intent of the Committee on Agriculture to include nonsalable commodities in determining the quantity of harvested commodities.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman if it was the intent of the Committee on Appropriations to limit their concern over this problem just to dry beans, or whether it was their intent to merely highlight one of the commodities affected by the Department's faulty interpretation?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in that he repeats the problem that we have with regard to other commodities. We did not attempt to limit our concern to just dry beans, it applies to fruit and whatever.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman and I appreciate his interest and all his work, and I am sure that by bringing out the fact that it was the intent of the authorizing committee and now the distinguished chairman agreeing, that was the intent of the Committee on Appropriations and the mention of beans is, but to quote, one of the items that can be encompassed as the total.

I appreciate my distinguished colleague speaking.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOLEY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLEY: At the end of the reading of the bill for amendment, on page 36, strike lines 19-24.

On page 38, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 403. From the funds made available in fiscal year 1989 for programs or activities not mandated by law, except for accounts receiving supplemental appropriations in this Act, 0.57 percent is canceled from each account, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That the fiscal year 1989 obligation limitation for each account with such a limitation is reduced by 0.57 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes and the amendment shall not be subject to amendments.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am offering today is a very simple one, and although the reading is waived, I think it might be well to read it.

It says:

From the funds made available in fiscal year 1989, for programs or activities not mandated by law, except for accounts receiving supplemental appropriations under this act, 0.57 percent is cancelled from each account, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That the fiscal year 1989 obligation limitation for each account with such a limitation is reduced by 0.57 percent.

The supplemental appropriation bill today carries a cost, and although I agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee and members of the Committee on Appropriations that we have a dire emergency and that we do need funds, I also believe that Members of the House want to live within some fiscal constraint and want to achieve some fiscal balance with the passage of this bill.

This amendment will offset the amount of outlays for 1989 required by the supplemental appropriation bill. It is fair. It covers each account, other than mandated entitlement accounts, except for the accounts covered in the supplemental itself. It is a fiscally responsible amendment, and Members should be, I think, cognizant of the fact that this is the first opportunity we will have this year to indicate whether we are going to live within the budget restraints, whether we are going to establish some kind of

balance in dealing with the critical problems of the country, and whether we will stay within the budget resolutions and comply with the terms of our agreements.

□ 1400

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1990 budget resolution has not come forward to the House yet, but it will be here in the next week or so.

I am of the opinion that both Democratic and Republican members of the Budget Committee would strongly endorse some action similar to what I am proposing. There were differences on exactly how this offset should be done.

The amendment I am offering cuts across discretionary accounts except those receiving supplemental appropriation in this bill. Some of these cuts are actually less than the unexpended balances remaining in the accounts for the various appropriations from last year. So, although this amendment does constitute a savings, we are not going to hamper existing programs.

Mr. Chairman, I think individual Members would like to ask:

Why isn't there an exemption for my program? We have an interest in this particular area that is vitally necessary for the national interest.

I think it is obvious, if we would care to go into every account, every program, and every activity of the Federal Government, that everybody would have some program for which they would be willing to defend against any cuts at all whether it is in the field of health, education, science, research, or defense.

This amendment cuts across all those programs except in entitlement accounts, and it provides an equal treatment of a fifty-seven hundredth of a percent cut.

This supplemental appropriation is badly needed. This amendment is important to the success of this supplemental appropriation, and in defense of it, I would point out that my amendment is fiscally responsible and consistent with what I believe to be the intent of the 1987 summit agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any Member who is opposed to the Foley amendment?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Foley amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the valid need for some of the new funding contained in this supplemental package. But I cannot agree to the offset proposal being offered by the majority leader, which mandates an across-the-board cut of \$1.7 billion from the ongoing, current programs of the Defense Department.

With only 5 months left in the fiscal year—we are being asked to tell the managers at DOD that they will have \$1.7 billion less with which to carry out our Nation's worldwide defense responsibilities.

We are being asked to tear up an agreement—reached a year and a half ago by the leadership on both sides of the Capitol and the President—which set a solid number that the President and the Pentagon were told over and over they could rely on in shaping our defense plans and responsibilities.

For that reason alone, if the Foley amendment passes, I believe the President will—as he should—veto what in my opinion is nothing more than a last second scheme.

But before we vote, all of us need to understand what a cut of this size, with less than half the fiscal year left, will force on the leadership at our DOD.

I can see some thinking—\$1.7 billion, well we can get that if we delay contracts, or some other action. No matter if this would mean renegotiating contracts on the F-16, or the Bradley fighting vehicle, or our new Aegis destroyers. I can see Members thinking, Defense will find some way to manage the cut.

The key word is "manage." Under the Foley amendment, DOD doesn't get to manage the cut. The amendment tells them where the money comes from—from each and every Defense account. What the Foley amendment calls for is just like a Gramm-Rudman sequester—where all defense accounts are cut, without regard to impact or affect. In fact, the Foley amendment is worse than a sequester because even military personnel—our men and women in the field—are not spared. This isn't micromanagement—its management by meat cleaver.

Let me tell you what this means. In the military personnel accounts, DOD will have to slice \$448 million. There's no discretion allowed. There will be almost half a billion cut from the accounts which support and pay our active duty, Guard and Reserve personnel.

This late in the year, a cut of this size spells disaster. Listen to what this means:

There will be an unplanned and irrational cut in force structure—the early retirement or release of 28,000 troops.

There won't be adequate funds for planned change of station moves, bringing our people home from their overseas duty, and these moves will

have to be frozen. And so you understand this burden—because of the original summit agreement defense had to stretch these tours by 6 months to a year. And now we are asked to add more time to this service—even more time away from home and family.

Medical care for our service members and their dependents will be cut by \$75 million. A \$75 million cut, from an area where last year this Congress found a pressing need and we added money over the budget.

We do not want to do this.

What about readiness? No discretion there, either, because the operations and maintenance accounts would take a \$490 million reduction.

This means a \$160 million cut against pay for our civilian personnel. The only way to deal with this is furloughs, layoffs, and RIF's at our depots, and shipyards.

Readiness cuts also means cutting off flying and steaming hours. It means canceling exercises. And it means eliminating 25 percent—one quarter—of scheduled training for our Guard and Reserve forces.

For the past 5 years this House and the country has struggled with trying to do "more with less" as Defense spending has fallen. And if there's any consensus that's emerged, it is that if Defense has to come down we must make reasoned, sound decisions.

Our last two Secretaries of Defense—Frank Carlucci, and now our former colleague Dick Cheney—have put forward their priorities—good people; readiness; and smart, efficient acquisition. These simple goals have been saluted by this body and in the fiscal 1989 Defense bill we overwhelmingly endorsed them.

Today we are being asked to throw these priorities away. We're being asked to renege on our commitment and impose a senseless, slashing \$1.7 billion cut on the Pentagon.

Here we are, just 1 day after Dick Cheney thoughtfully puts forward a plan to cancel or curtail major military programs, in order to protect people, readiness, and efficient acquisition and we are being asked to unravel those very pillars of our defense effort.

Mr. Chairman, I point out to the Members of the House that this is misguided and it is wrong. I strongly urge a "no" vote against the Foley amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] has expired.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me ask, what does the gentleman propose we do here?

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I have a very cogent suggestion. We had 195 votes against the rule when this bill came up because of the uneasiness in the Chamber. Let us go back to the appropriations committee and start over. Let us not send down to the President a bill that is going to be vetoed.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McDADE. Yes, and I am proud of being a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is a member of the committee, and we had an opportunity for one of the members of the committee, the ranking member of the committee, to offer an alternative. The Rules Committee made that in order, but the gentleman has chosen not to offer it.

Mr. McDADE. Let me say to my friend that the handwriting is on the wall here about what is going to happen.

Mr. FOLEY. What does the gentleman believe is going to happen?

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that we hope very strongly this amendment is defeated and this bill goes back to the Appropriations Committee. We did this last year. My friend remembers a supplemental that got loaded down and went down to the White House and got vetoed. Then it came back and we passed a smaller supplemental bill. We went through all that last year.

□ 1410

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] knows, I think, that outlays for the Defense Department have risen over \$4.5 billion since last year when we avoided sequester. If my amendment were adopted, there would be about \$3 billion in outlays for the defense accounts over and above the terms of the 1987 summit agreement. My amendment is not unfair to Defense.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], "You can use that figure. The outlays for the rest of the Government then have been up about \$30 billion," and I think the gentleman knows that, and we do not control outlays. We are talking here about budget authority, and almost halfway through, more than halfway through the fiscal year, his amendment would impose unmanageable restrictions on the Department of Defense that I say in good conscience to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], my friend, they cannot execute.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I know that is

the gentleman's opinion. I am confident that the Department of Defense can execute the mandates presented by the Congress. They always have managed quite well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] knows.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I say to my friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], they do when we give them some time, but here we are in the last half of the ninth inning with an agreement that was reached by a group of people in the room, a number that nobody has had hearings on, and here we are going to impose it on them that far through the fiscal year. I say to the gentleman that they cannot manage it that they—

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] and his colleagues to believe that, if we are going to spend money, let us pay for it. Let us not just run the deficit up.

Mr. McDADE. Oh, we have always believed in that, and I hope we can do that.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I am normally opposed to percentage cuts. I want to say that, if we get in the habit of it, the committee will, as a matter of course, put money in there so it can be taken out.

However, Mr. Chairman, we need to get to conference because there are some very urgent things in this bill. I did not get to see the amendment earlier, but, having been on defense since 1943, with the exception of 2 years, I can see some of the problems that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] has pointed out.

However may I say that what we need to do is to get to conference, and I can assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] that, as a member of the subcommittee, we will work with the Department of Defense to work this thing out where they can handle it in a way and not have to deal with each item.

May I point out to all of my colleagues that I have supported the Defense Department far longer than any of them, I hope as well. But with such cuts, if we work it where they can adjust it to suit themselves, when we get through, they will have for this year \$297,200 million, which is over \$3 billion more than was agreed to in the summit. They will have at the end of this year \$259.6 billion unspent. They will have at the end of this year \$41.2 billion not even obligated.

So, we do need to give the relief that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] points out by letting them work it out like they want to and

not having to deal with individual items.

I did not get to see the amendment in advance. I agree with it. But I say that what we are trying to do here is to get to conference and get this behind us so these urgent supplementals will be available to the veterans and to all the others.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope we will go along with this so we can get to conference, and I assure my colleagues that, as the chairman of the committee and a longtime member of the subcommittee, we will work it out where it will not require all the detail that has been pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, chapter 6 of the supplemental that is now before the Committee, contains five items that are under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. Three of these items are money items. The total, as requested by President Bush for these items was \$1,446 million. The subcommittee recommended to the full committee, and we have in this bill, the sum of \$1,442 million. We have about a \$4.4 million reduction below the amounts requested by the President. Chapter 6 does not include any increase in discretionary budget authority or outlays for activities under these Departments. The \$1,442 million is call for entitlements.

Mr. Chairman, if the Foley amendment is adopted, \$226 million will be cut out of the regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 1989 that was signed into law on September 20 of last year. Mr. Chairman, the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee stayed under the section 302(b) allocation that we received last year. We did everything possible to bring this bill to the House under the amount, keeping under Gramm-Rudman, which we did.

Despite this, if this amendment is adopted, as I said to my colleagues, \$226 million will be cut out from these programs. Just let me give my colleagues a few examples.

In job training it would cut \$21 million. As far as biomedical research, Mr. Chairman, —\$40.7 million. As far as drug abuse, treatment and prevention, the Foley amendment would cut the bill \$9 million. Social Security and Medicare, administrative costs, \$32 million. Low-income energy assistance, \$7 million. Head Start, \$7 million. Chapter 1 compensatory education, \$26 million. Education for the handi-

capped, \$11 million. Student financial assistance, \$33 million.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of a Member in this House on either side of the aisle that is against the item in the bill pertaining to the Veterans' Administration. Any urgent emergency bill that passes in this House will contain the amount for the veterans. But why do they want to come in here at this time and say to the committee, "The reduction has to come out of those programs pertaining to health and education"?

Mr. Chairman, we brought out a good bill last year. It was under our 302(b) ceiling and it was signed into law. The question has arisen during this debate as to what we would do if we do not adopt the Foley amendment and the bill fails today, Mr. Chairman. All we have to do is bring out a clean bill. In that bill put in the money for Veterans' Administration. Put in the money for guaranteed student loans and other mandatory programs. Put in the trade adjustment money. All we have to do is to put in there only the essential items and the House will adopt it.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], my friend for years now, along with the other members of our subcommittee have said time after time, "If you take care of the health of your people and educate your children, you can continue living in the strongest country in the world."

The Foley amendment says, "In order to balance this out, we want to take \$226 million out of health and education."

Mr. Chairman, this is a mistake. It is a serious mistake. The bill that should be before this committee today should be a bill that my friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], the majority leader, would approve of, one that takes care of the Veterans' Administration, and the other items that I called attention to. We should not come in here and say "Let us cut the AIDS Program back a little amount here to pay for the \$7 million from research on a dread disease that is all around the world."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has expired.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, there is a way to bring this bill out and bring it out right. My colleagues know, and I know, and every member in this committee knows that, when this bill gets on the other side, if it stays in the current form, it will be turned into a Christmas tree if they have ever seen one.

□ 1420

In the conference we will be able to agree on them and then the bill that we send downtown to President Bush will be vetoed just as sure as I am standing on this floor today.

Now, why do we want to go through that? These items are important.

My friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] is a good majority leader, Mr. Chairman. Certainly, he is in favor of these items for the Veterans' Administration. So am I.

He is in favor of these items pertaining to guaranteed student loans, and so am I.

Mr. Chairman, he wants to pay back to the States, the 50 States, the amounts in the foster care and adoption assistance programs, and so do I.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us do it right. Let us turn down the Foley amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, we all here I think recognize the problem that the majority leader was trying to address with his amendment, but I want our colleagues to know some of the problems that will be created by this amendment.

We have a new Secretary of Defense who is held, I suspect, in as high regard as the gentleman from Washington is held. Yesterday when new Defense Secretary Cheney came before the Armed Services Committee of this body to testify for the first time before this Congress, he was told of the proposed Foley amendment during the lunch break. He returned to the hearing to express great consternation at the prospect that the Foley amendment might be adopted by this body. He had just testified how he had to cut \$10 billion from the budget offered earlier this year, how painful it was for him to do that, particularly with the Members of this body, many of us lobbying him for our favorite projects.

Most of the people on the committee expressed great concerns about specific projects that had to be cut, that they did not want cut. Many of these same programs will be impacted as much by the across-the-board cuts required by the Foley amendment.

I believe, my friends, that the law of unintended consequences will play here, and I would like to describe just a few of the unintended consequences that were not discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania earlier.

This program, which is not to be managed, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, would reduce defense funding by \$1.7 billion, including the following budget title reductions:

Military personnel, \$448 million.

Operation and maintenance, \$490 million.

Procurement, \$452 million.

Research and development, \$214 million.

Military construction and family housing, \$50 million.

These are unmanaged cuts that Secretary of Defense Cheney does not know how he will be able to handle.

The Defense budget has already been weakened by 4 years of negative real growth and would be further damaged by the impact of this further \$1.7 billion reduction.

It would provide an increase in negative real growth in fiscal year 1987 from 1.3 to 1.8 percent, and reductions would fall severely in key areas; for example, military personnel, operations and maintenance, research and development appropriations, where there is very little flexibility to absorb reductions at this late stage in the fiscal year. That is the real problem that we are talking about here.

Reserve and Guard programs would be hit hard. I know there are some people here who are very concerned about the Reserve and Guard.

Almost 25 percent of the schools, special mobilization training, would be eliminated. This would have a direct negative impact on our readiness.

It would freeze PCS moves. I know we are concerned about our constituents who are concerned about their families.

It disrupts the proper staffing of critical positions, as well as family plans, such as movement to new schools and selection of new homes. A serious morale problem would result.

It would stop the payment of reenlistment bonuses. It reduces real property maintenance, people maintenance that would have to be made in order to avoid personnel reductions.

Five to ten military construction projects would be eliminated and planned maintenance of family housing units would have to be curtailed. Morale would be obviously adversely affected by this, and operating costs would not be reduced.

Since two-thirds of the year is gone, the reduction in RDT&E would have to be taken, and technology and research programs at the laboratories and the universities, and by curtailing planned testing of weapons systems.

Scientists and engineers would be laid off until the fiscal year 1990 when funds are available.

The problem with this is that in this highly competitive environment that exists in the technology field, it is likely that many of these people would not return. Programs, in other words, will suffer a long-term negative impact from this short-term problem.

It also will have the effect of disrupting ongoing contract negotiations as procurement requests are withdrawn to accommodate the lower levels of spending in 1989.

Mr. Chairman, these are unacceptable consequences. We cannot continually ask Defense to cut and then cheat on the agreements which have been reached in good faith, and it brings into great doubt the efficacy of the 1990 agreement just announced by the President and the Congress.

As I said, it is not necessary, and it is not necessary to vote aye on the Foley amendment to be fiscally responsible. We can vote aye on the motion to recommit and achieve that objective.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Foley amendment, to redo the bill to provide for the emergency funds that are necessary.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to remind my colleagues that we have worked for 4 years since 1986 to get the military involved in the war against drugs, and they are now doing something. They reported to the Armed Services Committee just a couple days ago that they are stopping planes on the southern border of the United States. These cuts in O&M will slow down that effort and will hurt the war against drugs by the military.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I had asked for some time for myself, but I just heard the gentleman's remarks. I could not say it nearly as well as the gentleman has. I subscribe to everything that the gentleman said.

It will have a tremendous impact on morale. It is going to interrupt families. It is going to create more separation. It is going to impact reenlistments. It is going to put uncertainty and a pall over the entire military establishment if we break faith, and that is what this is, a breach of faith.

We start out with an agreement, a budget summit. We knew what the figure was. This not only impacts that, but it dips into it in order to pick up programs that are domestic in nature.

We have already taken our proportionate cut in defense. It is a breach of faith. It will have a particular effect for many years to come if we do not keep faith with our people, including the families of those who were just in the funeral of the men from the Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said it very well, and I thank him.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to comment that it is interesting to see the parade of Republican Members who have so much trouble with these across-the-board cuts. President Bush in his suggested alternative suggested almost twice this cut across the board in virtually every

domestic account. I am sure that would produce a lot of pain as well, but our friends on the other side only see problems in the Defense account. They apparently do not see problems in any other.

Are we going to be fiscally responsible or not? Are we going to pay for these necessary expenditures or not?

I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky, my friend, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, and I do believe that this bill that is brought to the floor today by the Appropriations Committee is one of the best and one of the leanest and one of the most well-organized bills I have seen in a supplemental in the years I have been here.

I think that sometime along the line here we are going to have to ask ourselves the tough question, "Can we have these additional spending bills, urgent and dire and needed as they are, and yet avoid any method of paying for them?" That is the question that I think we have to ask and the question the House has to answer.

□ 1430

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make the point that there are a number of us on this side who are not just concerned about defense but also concerned about some other areas. For instance, I have some figures I will talk about in just a minute, but about what this does to the science programs in the Nation. Science programs in the Nation are going to be very, very heavily impacted.

Mr. FOLEY. Does the gentleman know that the President's proposal would take twice as much out of domestic discretionary programs?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I am prepared to oppose the President when he takes away the seed core of the science of this Nation, too. It does not make any sense to do it here on the floor when we are in dire straits.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that the NASA account was increased by 20 percent last year. We are not asking anyone to take more than a 0.57-percent reduction.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address an inquiry to the gentleman, the distinguished majority leader. If I understand his amendment, what he is suggesting is that supplementals should be revenue neutral?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. I think as much as possible we ought to make them deficit neutral.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. From listening to the debate, I understand that the gentleman's amendment would utterly devastate a wide range of functions. What portion of spending cuts does the gentleman effect in these impacted areas? How much of the money is the gentleman going to take away from these other programs?

Mr. FOLEY. As I say, we are talking about 0.57 of 1 percent. The total amount of the offset is approximately the amount of the fiscal year 1989 discretionary domestic and defense outlays contained in this bill, or \$1.44 billion.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Let me say to the gentleman that I believe the amendment that he has brought before the House establishes a very important principle. It says that we mean what we say when we pass a budget. It says that we are going to do the honorable thing in trying to allocate funding to the most important areas.

I must say that I am concerned about the debate that has been brought up, and I am going to have to weigh the alternatives if the gentleman's amendment passes. I do not intend to vote for the Supplemental Appropriation even if this amendment passes. I favor living within the budget, but I will not support transferring funds from defense programs to domestic spending. Defense spending currently is within the budget limit, while an increase in domestic spending would not be. It strikes me that the gentleman's amendment is a very responsible thing to do. It is an amendment that would have saved this country billions of dollars, and I intend to support it.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not like across-the-board amendments. I never have, and one of the reasons is because they cut those programs that got too little funding as well as those that got too much.

However, keep this in mind: At this time we are not passing an act. This is the first step in passing a bill; it has to pass here. It has to pass in the Senate. It will go to conference. There will have to be some kind of an agreement with the administration. This is not the final act today. This is the first step.

It has been said that we have got to have offsets for the discretionary accounts which receive additional funding in the bill. Then we hear all of these complaints that the Defense Department cannot share in the offsets. That is what this is all about.

Let me tell the Members that they did not have any trouble finding \$66 million for the Contras; just as soon as the administration said, "You need an

offset for this," they found it overnight. They did not have any trouble finding \$125 million in transfers for international affairs in this bill. They found an offset for that out of defense funds, but whenever we want them to find offsets for domestic programs the administration says that they cannot find it.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a mid-year revision. Whenever we have a trillion dollar budget for 12 months we often come to a place 6 months through the fiscal year where we know some account has too much money or more than they need and others do not have enough. We have to have a revision. In past years all we did was just add to the accounts that did not get enough and let the others keep their money. Some of them got as much as a 20-percent increase last year while others were held to an increase of less than inflation. Of course, there has to be some kind of revision. There has to be some adjustments provided in this bill to keep a couple of agencies from having furloughs right away, and so what we have here is a midyear revision.

What the gentleman from Washington has proposed is that to show good faith we have a 0.57-percent reduction in all discretionary programs which were funded in fiscal year 1989 except those for which additional appropriations are provided for in this bill. When we get over to the Senate, they will have a different idea probably, but the administration can help us if they want to find one-tenth of 1 percent out of the Federal budget that is not going to be needed in this fiscal year. That is all we are talking about. We can find these offsets with their help.

As the gentleman from Washington said, the administration proposed a 1.099-percent cut in certain domestic discretionary programs in order to fund their supplemental requests they proposed twice as big a cut. That is the administration's proposal. That is what they want. The gentleman from Massachusetts proposed 0.67-percent reduction in certain domestic discretionary programs. That is bigger than the one that is proposed here.

These things in all of these bills that we are talking about, there would be cuts at this stage in the game, but, as I said, in a midyear revision we have got to have a bill that cuts across all departments.

Up to now we could have reprogramming, that is, within line items in a bill. We do that within committees without coming back to the floor, but to go and take some out of one department and give it to another, we have to have a bill.

Let us take, for example, a couple of things; take drugs. We have in here money only for the enforcement function. The enforcement function did

not get enough money last year. On top of that, we stayed here 3 extra weeks to pass a bill that almost everybody voted for that said we needed to increase enforcement. At the same time down in HHS, they were given a huge increase, and they could not absorb it, and they will not be able to in this fiscal year.

It takes a bill to take a little out of those programs that they do not need, and they cannot spend this fiscal year, and put it where it is needed. That is a midyear revision. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman, we then talk about a clean bill. We talk about what it ought to be. If it happens to be what is called mandatory, nobody even raises a question. Student loans are going to cost us \$892 million more than was anticipated at the beginning of the fiscal year, primarily because interest rates have gone up. Nobody even mentions that. That is OK. That does not mean anything. That is just pennies. But when we come to \$725 million for drugs because crime has increased in the country, they say, "That is discretionary spending. We cannot do that."

What we have here is a midyear revision. I ask the Members to support the Foley amendment. When we get to conference, we will find a better way to handle the problem of offsets.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation, I want to alert my colleagues to the devastating impact that the proposed \$1.7 billion Defense cut would have on our men and women in uniform. As the fastest spending account in the Defense budget, military personnel would take a major hit—a half billion dollars. Believe me, there is no way to find that level of funding this late in the fiscal year without substantial pain to a lot of service people.

I could raise the "red flag" of massive end strength cuts, but the level required would be absurd. At this point in the fiscal year, by the time we factor in moving and separation costs, you would save less than \$2,000 per person. How many of this body are Marines? Look at it this way: It would mean an end strength cut larger than the total size of the Marine Corps. Obviously, that is ridiculous.

How then would the Department of Defense realistically achieve such cuts? Let me lay out one scenario. First, it could immediately stop a large portion of Reserve and National Guard training, seriously cutting the readiness capabilities of the Reserve Forces. Second, with the exception of those coming into or leaving the service, we could postpone all transfers until the next fiscal year. The personal disruption to the families involved—

many of whom may have already sold their homes in anticipation of a summer move—would, of course, be devastating. In addition, delaying the cost of these moves until after October 1 could create a budgetary time bomb for fiscal year 1990. Third, we could achieve additional savings by stopping the reenlistment bonuses currently paid to retain those individuals in whom we have invested the greatest amount of specialized training. During that 4 or 5 month bonus moratorium, with unemployment at the lowest rate in 14 years, the services would likely lose the best and the brightest of their skilled enlisted force to private sector employers, at a time when we have the best All-Volunteer Service in years. Finally, to make up the rest of the shortfall, the services could immediately—as of June 1—force out all those individuals not planning to reenlist. With a minimum of 30,000 such "early outs," the impact of this one-shot undermanning on force readiness would be dramatic. Some jobs would simply go undone. More importantly, other service members would have to work even longer hours to pick up the slack. That may not sound bad to you when we are talking about Pentagon or headquarters staff. But, what about the sailors deployed on aircraft carriers who are already working 12 to 14 hours per day? Or those standing alert in the far reaches of the globe? How about the young men a week ago who saved the *Iowa*?

I have tried to lay out a realistic option for how DOD could make massive, short-term cuts in the military personnel account. There is no question that the price to the Government and the individual soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines would be extraordinary. Clearly, we would be paying the bill in personnel turbulence and reduced readiness for a very long time to come. I urge Members' opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1430

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to dispel the myth that Democrats and even some on our side are soft on defense simply because they feel that when domestic programs are being squeezed they should take it out of defense. I think that is a sincere belief that some Members have. I just disagree with it.

Second, I wish we would treat the man on active duty with as much concern as we do the veteran. About 40 percent of the Defense budget is personnel and personnel support. We certainly treat the veterans, and rightly so, with kid gloves, but somehow the man on duty does not get treated quite that way.

Last, the intelligence functions of this country are very important. I suggest there is a relationship between the Defense budget and how well we conduct our intelligence around the world. And while we are concerned about satellites and verifying treaties in a world consumed with terrorism, I think we ought to be very careful about where we slice, continually slice the Defense budget.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, let me build upon what the gentleman from Illinois is saying by just going into some of the concerns that I have about the Foley amendment as it relates to the science policy of this country.

The Foley language is going to take more than \$96 million out of the science accounts of this Nation. That is between \$52 million and \$61 million out of NASA, \$30 million to \$35 million out of the Department of Energy research, \$11 million to \$13 million out of the National Science Foundation, the seedcorn agency of the Nation, \$2 million to \$3 million out of the Environmental Protection Agency for their research programs, and about \$1 million out of the National Institute for Standards Technology, the place that we have to have funded to get good science commercialized. I suggest that that is not the right approach in a fiscally responsible society.

It seems to me that we are also doing something else which is just as devastating. By changing the base lines as this particular amendment would do, we not only aggravate the problem for this year, we roll it over into next year. Under this amendment, the base lines will change so that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology allocations for science next year will be reduced by between \$102 million and \$120 million. That means that we will have less money for the research and development that this Nation needs to remain competitive. That is not a fiscally responsible approach, that is a fiscally irresponsible approach, and I think it is time to defeat the Foley amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will admit then that the Conte amendment which was published in the rule was, by the same token, more

fiscally irresponsible since it would have cut 0.67 percent from these accounts rather than 0.57 percent?

Mr. WALKER. I will say to the gentleman I have the same concerns about that amendment and expressed those concerns. But let me say to the gentleman that I have interpreted his amendment, though, as saying that the committee bill as it came out was fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania then is saying that President Bush's submission was fiscally irresponsible since it proposed to cut 1.099 percent from certain domestic discretionary accounts?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just say to the gentleman that I also have concerns about the Bush administration when they begin to cut out of the science accounts of this Nation and those research and development accounts, and I am opposed to the Bush administration doing it just as I am opposed to the gentleman from Washington doing it.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it fiscally irresponsible for the President to suggest that to the Nation?

Mr. WALKER. I did not say that it was. I think it is fiscally irresponsible to take away from the future.

Mr. FOLEY. I am giving the gentleman from Pennsylvania a simple proposition. If it is fiscally irresponsible to suggest a fifty-seven-one hundredths of a percent cut in science as well as every other area, then it must be fiscally irresponsible to cut 0.67 percent or 1.009 percent as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and the President proposed for certain domestic discretionary programs?

Mr. WALKER. Let me say to the gentleman that his percentage amounts to \$61 million out of NASA, and that means it impacts on the space station and on other programs for the future, and that is just not the right approach.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished ranking minority member for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I debated speaking today. It is difficult for me to be opposed to the distinguished majority leader in what he is trying to do. But I

think it is also important to give a little bit of information that may be helpful to Members.

I do not look at this particular action we are taking now, this across-the-board cut, as being the issue at all. I think we have to start dealing up front with what the issues are before the country.

Science, space, technology, and education are the future wealth and opportunity of this country. I want to just read a report that came out today and that was delivered in reference to what is happening in the United States on creating new wealth. I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

American scientists at Raytheon invented the microwave oven but today it is Korean and Japanese companies who produce 90% of the world's microwave ovens including well over two-thirds of those bought by Americans. American scientists at RCA invented the color television, but today European and East Asian companies produce over 97% of the world's color televisions including 85% of those bought by Americans. American scientists at Ampex invented the VCR, but today Japanese, Korean and European companies produce over 99% of the world's VCRs including virtually all of those bought by Americans. "Try this one on for size." American scientists funded by DARPA invented the computer numerically controlled machine tool, but today European and Japanese companies produce over 75% of these machines, including over 60% of those bought by American companies.

American scientists at AT&T Bell Labs & Texas Instruments invented the base technology that produced the world's first memory chip, but today Japanese companies produce over 80% of the world's memory chips including over 50% of those bought by American companies. American scientists backed by NASA sent the first commercial communications satellites into space but today, it is a European company, Aerieenne Espace, which has acquired well over half of the commercial space launching business.

So the list goes on. I would hope that we would look to the priorities in this country. We are talking about jobs for the future. We are talking about rebuilding the economic, dynamic foundation of this country. That is what is at stake. It is not a question of cuts across the board.

We in this House have to start making up our mind on a bipartisan basis what are the priorities of America. Either we are going to create new wealth, which we are going to need, through education, and the billions and hundreds of billions we are going to need as far as the health care of this country are concerned, or we are going to just sit and dawdle away on things that are dissipating the wealth of the Nation.

What are we doing, asking that we do this for me? No, we are saying think about the future productivity and the capability of this country to produce the resources we need and for

the education and other things that we need.

I hate to do this because I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], but I hope in some way after 21 years in this House I can get some of my colleagues to understand that we are not just talking about what is being taken from my committee. I do not represent my committee, I represent 600-some-odd thousand people in my district in New Jersey, and we are concerned about these decisions, and we are concerned about the future of this country and where the new wealth is going to come from.

□ 1450

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would announce the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has 8 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] will be entitled to close the debate.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was really torn yesterday between admiration for the speed and skill with which the leadership came up with a new amendment meeting the fiscal concerns of some Members and the lack of detailed understanding of what that amendment would do.

I could not decide whether I thought that the Foley amendment was an act of genius or whether in fact its unintended consequences were extraordinarily disruptive.

I stand here today, I am not quite sure what the message is supposed to be in this amendment. It is the closest thing to Jimmy Carter's unilateral disarmament we have seen in a long time. It basically says we can get to a balanced budget if only we abolish the Defense Department.

I am sure that some of my antidefense friends will immediately start laughing. But let me read what the Secretary of Defense says. The Secretary of Defense is a former colleague of ours. He is a man who understands this building fairly well. He works for a President who has been reaching out, I think, trying to be bipartisan and who has tried to say to the leadership on both sides of the aisle: We truly can be different than the Reagan years if we can sit in a room and make agreements and work together. We truly can manage this Federal Government together in a bipartisan way if we are willing to keep our word and to be bipartisan.

This is what Dick Cheney, our former colleague, has to say in a letter to BOB MICHEL:

It has come to my attention that the Democratic leadership proposes to fund the supplemental for Fiscal Year 1989 by imposing a reduction of \$1.7 billion on the defense budget for the current fiscal year. If such a measure passes, I will recommend to the President that he veto the Supplemental Appropriations Bill.

Attached is a memo explaining in some detail the impact of the proposed reduction. .57% sounds like a small number until you realize that we are in the final four months of the fiscal year and that it can only come out of certain accounts. The reduction would fall most severely on personnel, O and M accounts, and research and development, where there is very little flexibility this late in the fiscal year.

In putting together the President's DOD budget proposals for FY 1990, I have been very careful to avoid cuts which would interfere with our ability to recruit and retain first-class people for the nation's armed forces. This proposal would do enormous damage before we even get to FY 90.

The cuts would force me to freeze permanent change of station moves, disrupting plans of military families. I would have to stop payment of reenlistment bonuses which would seriously reduce our ability to retain trained and skilled people, and I would have to provide for the early release of some 28,000 people scheduled to leave the service between now and the end of the fiscal year. This would have very serious consequences for the manning of our forces.

I am also deeply disturbed as a former Member of the House of Representatives at the prospect that commitments made by the Congress in the fall of 1987 concerning funding measures for defense in FY 89 will not be kept. If we are to have a period of greater consultation and cooperation between the President and the Congress on matters of national security policy in the years ahead, I believe it is essential that Congress live up to its commitments.

I hope that this unwise proposal will be defeated. If it is not, I will urge the President in the strongest possible terms to veto the measure when it reaches his desk.

My final conclusion, Chairman WHITTEN, is simple: If you want a dire emergency supplemental signed, we must defeat the Foley amendment. If the Foley amendment passes, it will certainly be vetoed and that will in fact make it harder for the veterans and it will mean less money available for drug interdiction.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, just to say that the only difference between my amendment and the Conte amendment, which was not offered is three words: two figures of 0.67 percent rather than 0.57 percent—the higher cuts on the Conte side—than I am offering and the word "domestic." The Conte proposal was limited to only "domestic" discretionary programs.

Our Republican friends seem to understand the problem with across-the-board cuts when they apply to defense and all other accounts but not to understand them when they apply to domestic accounts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr.

WHITTEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I have always recommended each subcommittee chairman as conferees. Let us go to conference. We are talking like you are cutting up a melon on the table, cutting it up.

If we do not get to conference, we do not get a bill and you do not get any of this and you will not get a bill.

We have been trusted in conference to take care of what we hear on the floor with respect to the various programs. I am all for it. I have brought you a bill as best I could with the support of the Committee. But let us get to conference so that we can work these things out.

Most of what I have heard here about programs and the need for them I agree with. Give us a chance to go to conference so we can get something. We will not get anything until we get there.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield back the remaining 1 minute?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my remaining 1 minute.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said about the Conte amendment, which I decided not to offer. I did offer it in committee, but I got beat, and I mean, beat tough. And I gave a lot of thought to whether to offer it. Instead I argued here in the well against adoption of the rule. I thought that was the proper thing to do—not give a waiver, of the Budget Act, send this bill back to the Committee on Appropriations, and let us bring out a lean bill. And if any chairman of any subcommittee, those great cardinals of the U.S. House of Representatives, wanted to beef up his chapter, let him take it out of his bill some other place. Pay as you go.

It is easy to put money in a bill. It is a cinch. I have done it myself. I might be one of the bigger culprits in the House of Representatives; I will admit it. It is easy to put it in. But it is darned tough to take it out.

Now my dear and beloved friend, Mr. FOLEY, mentioned what he said was the one difference between my amendment and his amendment—at least what was my amendment. I was glad to see him incorporate 90 percent of my amendment into his, and glad to see him go for a little fiscal responsibility on that side of the aisle. But there was another big difference in my amendment. My amendment cut \$944 million of real money.

I cut out \$453 million in drug programs; I cut \$250 million in the Japanese-American internment repayment; I cut \$241 million for homeless programs.

It was painful, painful for me to do that. But I served on the 1987 budget summit with our leader, and I complimented him after that. He was a great chairman, one of the best. We would have never had an agreement if it was not for the majority leader, Mr. FOLEY, one of the finest men I have ever met in my life. We signed in blood on that agreement, and we said "no more supplementals."

I used to get banged on the head here on the well every time we took up a supplemental. They said, "You guys on appropriations are a bunch of fakers. You always know how to get around the budget. You cut your bills and then you come around with a supplemental later on and put it all back in."

"No," we said, "no more of that, no more trickery here. We are going to play above the table." And we did. So this is the first bill, that tests us, the first real test.

A lot of remarks were made today about the Contra aid. I voted against the Contra aid. In full committee, I said, "Look, how in the heck can we vote for Contra aid and not vote money for the veterans? I don't know how you can go home and justify a thing like this."

I voted against the Contra aid, but I am standing here today saying vote against the Foley amendment. That hurts me to be opposed to Mr. FOLEY. I think I am with him 99 percent of the time. He is a beautiful human being and he is a great leader.

Today he is wrong.

We ought to vote against the Foley amendment, vote against the bill, and let us send this bill back to the committee and come out with a fiscally responsible bill. As BILL NATCHER said, take care of the veterans health care, take care of the firefighters, take care of the Soviet refugees, and peacekeeping.

□ 1500

Put in the guaranteed student loans, the trade adjustment assistance, the foster care money, all mandatory, not discretionary. Take care of all those things which are mandatory, and the discretionary spending I mentioned, and weed out the rest.

In the Labor/HHS/Education Subcommittee, we didn't add one penny in our section. When we marked it up, they tried, and our good chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] said, "No, no, this is not the place to do it. Do it in the regular bill. Hold off on this amendment. Hold off on that amendment," and we did. We did not add one plug nickel.

So I think the proper way to go is to defeat the Foley amendment, defeat the bill, let us get back to committee tomorrow and bring out another bill, and it will go through here like a hot knife going through butter.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts invented the phrase "Kill with kindness," and appreciate the generous remarks. If I had more time I would yield him some additional time.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, we are here today to consider a dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill which includes \$100 million for refugees, most of it for Soviet refugees. I fully support this program which meets our moral obligation to those Soviet Jews and others whose cause we have long championed.

But there can be no more urgent dire emergency than the one presently unfolding in Dade County, FL—the sudden overcrowding and reduction of the quality of education of all the children in Dade County. The Dade County school system is the fourth largest in the country and it is in crisis because of decisions by the Federal Government over which it had no control. Five thousand Nicaraguan children who fled from Sandinista Nicaragua have enrolled in Dade schools since July. These children are refugees; our Government gave either explicit or tacit approval to their arrival. Federal Government policies encouraged them to immigrate.

Now we must educate them and all the other children in Dade County. It will cost over \$100 million to build new schools to eliminate the overcrowding their arrival caused. All the children in Dade, not just the refugee children, suffer when there is not enough classroom space and the classes are too large to give each child the attention he or she needs. In addition to the \$100 million needed for new schools, it is costing over \$20 million a year to educate the newcomers.

The taxpayers of Dade County have been responsible with their school system. They approved a bond issue to build the schools needed before the Nicaraguan influx. Their taxes fund a school system which provides an excellent education to their children. Now, all the children in Dade County schools will suffer because of Federal policies over which they had no control.

There are other expenses which Dade County and the State of Florida must bear because of the Nicaraguan influx, including substantial medical and other social service expenses. As a matter of simple fairness, the Federal Government, and not Dade County, should cover these costs which are about \$15 million a year.

We all recognize the Federal Government's responsibility for refugees, hence the \$100 million in this bill. The Federal Government has accepted this responsibility in the past during the Cuban migrations of the 1960's and the early 1980's. But how can we discriminate between refugees from Nicaragua and those from the Soviet Union? It is simply unfair to force one community which, solely because of its geographical location, to continue to bear the brunt of the Central American influx without reimbursement from the Federal Government which encouraged the influx in the first place.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the majority leader. It is our only option to meet our responsibility to provide a means of offsetting the additional discretionary spending in the committee bill. But I support the amendment with no great enthusiasm.

I do not believe in across-the-board cuts. This bill does not include across-the-board increases. It proposed specific increases to support carefully identified, high priority policy goals. We should be setting priorities in spending, and I agree with the priorities in this bill.

What are the dire emergencies these funds are appropriated to meet? Principally two. The shame of homelessness and the plague of drug-related crime. These are two of the most pressing crises facing our country today.

But no matter how dire the emergency, no matter how many children have no place to call home, no matter how many young people destroy their lives through drugs, no matter how many neighborhoods are terrorized by drug wars, we are still unable to identify any lower priority programs that could be cut to provide the needed funds.

All programs are not created equal. We have no difficulty choosing those, like helping the homeless or fighting drugs, that are more equal. That's the easy part of this job. The hard part, the part we have failed to do, is to choose those that are less equal, and that, given the fiscal mess we face, must be reduced to make a greater commitment possible to meet the dire emergencies. Across-the-board cuts are not an appropriate substitute for deliberate, reasoned spending reductions.

If we are unable to identify specific cuts, of course, we do have another alternative. In the Constitution, in article I, section 8, clause 1, it says Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes. We could pay for these increases by challenging the commandment that haunts this House and paralyzes this Government. The commandment is "Thou shalt not raise taxes."

Mr. Chairman, it's a false commandment. We all agree that we should be devoting greater resources to fighting drug crime and housing the homeless. And we have a responsibility to provide the resources required to meet society's needs. Under this amendment, we provide those resources by nickel and diming the rest of the Government. Some time in this Congress, we will cease to heed the President's lips and get on with governing this Nation. I hope it's sooner rather than later.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I support the Foley amendment and am concerned about the cuts in the IRS section, but we must move this session forward.

I rise today to express my concern about the impact that the substitute we are considering will have on the Internal Revenue Service. The Ways and Means' Oversight Subcommittee

tee, which I chair, has held hearings this year to review the funding and staffing levels of the Internal Revenue Service. Based on our continuing review of IRS operations, I am very concerned about the proposed domestic spending reductions on the IRS examinations and appeals account and on our entire Federal tax system.

Thus far in fiscal year 1989, the IRS has absorbed over \$350 million in unfunded cost increases, and this does not even include the costs associated with implementation of major legislation passed by the Congress in 1988. These costs are affecting the ability of the IRS to achieve the fiscal year 1989 goals outlined for programs in the examination and appeals account. For example: the audit rate is now approaching only 1 percent, far below the 1.27 percent originally estimated for fiscal year 1989; the ending case inventory for appeals is now expected to reach 61,200, 5,000 more cases than originally estimated; and the audit rate for tax exempt organizations is now estimated at 2.5 percent, almost half the original estimate. Mr. Chairman, it is absurd to make further cuts in these programs when the evidence of current funding shortfalls is staring us in the face.

In addition to the tax policy reasons just noted, I am troubled by the logic of these reductions. Cutting the IRS budget would actually cost the Federal Government more money than it will save. If the goal of these amendments is to help balance the budget, then why reduce the resources given to the IRS for revenue raising activities? Under the proposed amendments, the IRS budget would be reduced by \$10 to \$13 million, but there would be a gross revenue loss of \$45 million and a net revenue loss of \$32 million associated with this reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge legislation be passed to make it deficit-neutral, and I know that means reducing spending which will have a negative impact on every Member of this House. However, the continued reduction in funding for the IRS is not in the best interests of our Federal tax system or of our constituents, the taxpayers. As this legislation moves forward, I hope we can restore full funding for IRS, as well as full funding for many of our defense-related projects.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the majority leader has taken a lot of heat because he is making cuts, \$220 million, in programs that I care about a lot. I do not like that. But I would simply point out that the gentleman from Massachusetts' [Mr. CONTE] alternative, cuts \$40 million more out of the same programs, and the administration's original request cut \$425 million out of the same programs.

We are called "antidéfense" by the gentleman from Georgia because we have the temerity to suggest that a portion of this budget which has been doubled over the last years, the Pentagon budget, ought to be cut by half of 1 percent along with everything else in the budget, in order to pay for our obligations to the homeless, and in order

to pay for obligations to fight a full-fledged war on drugs.

I happen to disagree with that label. Life is full of choices and sometimes we are "damned if we do and damned if we don't," and this is one of those days.

The virtue of the Foley amendment is simply that it recognizes that fact and it tries to make those choices in the most fiscally and ideologically neutral way. That is about all Members can do in a situation like this, and I commend him for it.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his generosity, and let me say, as one of the small players in this science game, NASA and NSF, look, NASA had a 20-percent increase last year. NSF had a 10-percent increase. They are my favorite agencies. I will say with some agony and some pain, they can stand a reduction of half of 1 percent.

Let me address my friends on the Armed Services Committee, and from the New York Times article, dated April 24, 1989, I want Members to address this in your discussions and deliberations in your committee, and on the floor when we bring up the military bill.

In addition to his shifts on arms-control policies, Mr. Kohl has scrapped unpopular plans to extend mandatory military service from 15 to 18 months as of June and has asked the allies to sharply reduce low-level training flights in German airspace.

The extension had been ordered to offset a decline in the number of draft-age men, and Mr. Kohl had often pointed to it as proof of his commitment to a strong defense. Military experts said that without the extension, the West German armed forces would probably drop from its current strength of 495,000 to about 400,000 after 1993.

EXPLANATION IS REJECTED

In abandoning it, the Chancellor claimed that "new figures" made the extension no longer necessary. The explanation was widely rejected, most dramatically in a letter from Adm. Dieter Wellershoff, the inspector general of the armed forces, that was leaked to the press.

And Members are saying we cannot do this. They are on the front line with the evil empire. Why should we do for them what they will not do for us or for themselves? More importantly, the American public demand accountability, responsibility in military expenditures. When are we going to give it to them?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most important vote, because I think we will be signaling by this vote whether we are serious about living within the constraints of fiscal reductions to meet those requirements that the Congress has virtually unanimously adopted.

Now it is easy to go around here and say this is going to do harm to this ac-

count or that account—0.57 percent is the limit of the reduction in outlays, and I do not think the American people believe that it is going to do irreparable harm to any account in the Federal Government when we reduce it by 0.57 percent.

I have heard gentlemen on the other side, and I might say, time after time after time when they have offered across-the-board cuts, that this Government is not so perfect, it is not so lean, that we cannot accommodate a 1- or 2- or 3- or 4-percent cut. Indeed, the President endorsed a provision of 1.099 percent in domestic cuts, with some exceptions, and endorsed the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE's proposal to provide a 0.67 percent cut. If that could be done on all domestic cuts, certainly 0.57 percent can be absorbed across the board.

We are facing a watershed decision today, as much as I support the intentions of this supplemental appropriation bill, and I do, and I compliment the chairman and members of this committee for offering what I think is one of the best supplementals I have ever seen brought to this floor in terms of the straightforwardness and cleanness and hardness of the bill. The "dire emergency" provisions were included in the summit agreement of 1987, and I recognize the legitimacy of agreements that provisions of this bill should be considered as permitted under the summit agreement. Even so, I believe that we should offset these appropriations. I, therefore, urge Members to support the Foley amendment and the supplemental as amended. The time is now. The responsibility is ours.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, this supplemental appropriations bill has turned into a nightmare.

It is easy to come to the floor and criticize an appropriations bill for being a budget buster, but it is also just as easy to come to the floor and support a supplemental because it'll fight the war on drugs or help the homeless.

But now we have the Foley amendment which will cut defense, foreign aid, and domestic programs across the board to help pay for the supplemental.

I applaud this amendment for neutralizing the budgetary effect of the supplemental—I will not join those who complain that the Defense Department has been brought into the compromise. If we are going to take this Foley approach, we might as well cut everyone and everything equitably.

But I do want to make sure that everyone realizes that this across-the-board cut will hurt programs, vital programs we settled on last year as being important priorities.

If we pass the Foley amendment, we essentially rewrite all of last year's enacted appropriations bills—the 13 bills we passed separately and on time.

And that means that every dollar that is in this bill is a dollar that is coming out of some other account, some other program.

And that means that Members should think long and hard about whether everything that is in this bill—this bloated bill—is really necessary.

What we really need is a smaller supplemental—one that only funds truly necessary items. That smaller supplemental would be accompanied by a substantially smaller across the board cut.

But instead, the Democrats have to play politics; they have to try and embarrass the President.

And they just can't resist playing politics with drugs and homelessness.

So, yes, this bill will help the drugs and the homeless, but it will also cut NASA, NIH, cut maternal and child health, and many, many more accounts that were fully settled as priorities last year.

We need a smaller bill with a smaller across-the-board cut, something akin to what the President originally and responsibly proposed.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, if the Foley amendment currently before the House is adopted, the House will break a promise to America's 27 million veterans. By passing the supplemental funding bill before us, VA health care facilities will continue to wait for help and will be forced to continue to deny care to veterans.

This is unfair to these men and women, Mr. Chairman. A supplemental funding bill, by agreement, is adopted in order to provide additional funding for those programs facing a dire emergency. We all know that the VA health care program is in critical condition. But some of the programs funded in this measure are not, the administration is opposed to their inclusion, and they are, therefore, a direct threat to the survival of this health care system.

In 1988 the House Veterans' Affairs Committee discovered that more than 13,000 VA hospital beds had been taken out of service as each of the 172 medical facilities were facing an average budget shortfall of \$1.4 million in unfunded operating requirements.

At the VA facility in my own State, they are working with a \$1.5 million shortfall. I visited Togus on Friday and the men and women working there are doing an outstanding job in very trying circumstances. But they cannot continue without our immediate help.

By voting for the amendment before us, we are dooming our veterans' facilities to a minimum of 1 more month with no help. Another month in which they have to turn away veterans, close more wards, lose more staff. These men and women did not put us on hold when the country's security was at stake, and we do not have the right to put their health care on hold. Our veterans deserve better than this, Mr. Chairman. Far better.

I am going to vote against this amendment, because I understand the urgent need to provide additional funding for the veterans' health care system. I hope enough of my colleagues also understand the need so that we may defeat it. Then the committee can come back to us with a straightforward, no nonsense proposal.

The veterans of America need the funding provided in this bill, but they need it now, not

in 2 months after haggling over conference reports, veto overrides, and a new proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—ayes 172, noes 252, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

AYES—172

Ackerman	Gibbons	Owens (UT)
Akaka	Gordon	Pallone
Alexander	Gray	Panetta
Annunzio	Hamilton	Pease
Anthony	Hayes (IL)	Pelosi
Applegate	Hayes (LA)	Penny
Atkins	Hoagland	Pickle
Bates	Holloway	Poshard
Beilenson	Hoyer	Price
Berman	Huckaby	Rahall
Bonior	Hughes	Rangel
Borski	Jacobs	Rose
Bosco	Johnston	Rostenkowski
Boucher	Jones (NC)	Roukema
Boxer	Jontz	Roybal
Brennan	Kanjorski	Russo
Brooks	Kaptur	Sabo
Brown (CO)	Kastenmeier	Saiki
Bruce	Kennelly	Sangmeister
Bryant	Kildee	Savage
Campbell (CO)	Klecza	Sawyer
Cardin	LaFalce	Scheuer
Carper	Lantos	Schroeder
Chapman	Leach (IA)	Schuetter
Clarke	Lehman (CA)	Schumer
Coelho	Lehman (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Coleman (TX)	Leland	Sharp
Collins	Levin (MI)	Shays
Conyers	Levine (CA)	Sikorski
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Costello	Lipinski	Slatery
Coyne	Long	Slaughter (NY)
Crockett	Lowey (NY)	Smith (FL)
DeFazio	Lukens, Thomas	Smith (IA)
Dellums	Manton	Solarz
Dingell	Markey	Staggers
Dixon	Matsui	Stallings
Donnelly	Mazzoli	Stark
Downey	McCloskey	Swift
Dwyer	McDermott	Synar
Dymally	McHugh	Tanner
Eckart	Mfume	Tauzin
Edwards (CA)	Miller (CA)	Torres
English	Mineta	Towns
Espy	Moakley	Trafficant
Evans	Moody	Traxler
Fascell	Morella	Udall
Fazio	Morrison (CT)	Unsoeld
Feighan	Mrazek	Vento
Flake	Murphy	Volkmer
Foley	Nagle	Walgren
Ford (MI)	Neal (MA)	Waxman
Ford (TN)	Neal (NC)	Wheat
Frank	Nowak	Whitten
Frost	Oberstar	Wise
Garcia	Obey	Wolpe
Gejdenson	Olin	
Gephardt	Owens (NY)	

NOES—252

Anderson	Bereuter	Byron
Andrews	Bevill	Callahan
Archer	Bilbray	Campbell (CA)
Armey	Bliley	Carr
Aspin	Boehrlert	Chandler
AuCoin	Boggs	Clement
Baker	Broomfield	Clinger
Ballenger	Browder	Coble
Barnard	Brown (CA)	Coleman (MO)
Bartlett	Buechner	Combest
Barton	Bunning	Conte
Bennett	Burton	Coughlin
Bentley	Bustamante	Cox

Craig	Johnson (CT)	Richardson
Crane	Johnson (SD)	Ridge
Dannemeyer	Jones (GA)	Rinaldo
Darden	Kasich	Ritter
de la Garza	Kennedy	Roberts
DeLay	Kolbe	Robinson
Derrick	Kolter	Roe
DeWine	Kostmayer	Rogers
Dickinson	Kyl	Rohrabacher
Dicks	Lagomarsino	Roth
Dorgan (ND)	Lancaster	Rowland (CT)
Dornan (CA)	Laughlin	Rowland (GA)
Douglas	Leath (TX)	Sarpalius
Dreier	Lent	Saxton
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer
Durbin	Lewis (FL)	Schiff
Dyson	Lightfoot	Schneider
Early	Livingston	Schulze
Edwards (OK)	Lloyd	Shaw
Emerson	Lowery (CA)	Shumway
Engel	Lukens, Donald	Shuster
Erdreich	Machley	Sisisky
Fawell	Madigan	Skeen
Fields	Marlenee	Skelton
Fish	Martin (IL)	Slaughter (VA)
Flippo	Martin (NY)	Smith (MS)
Florio	Mavroules	Smith (NE)
Foglietta	McCandless	Smith (NJ)
Frenzel	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Galleghy	McCrery	Smith (VT)
Gallo	McCurdy	Smith, Denny
Gaydos	McDade	(OR)
Gekas	McEwen	Smith, Robert
Gillmor	McGrath	(NH)
Gilman	McMillan (NC)	Smith, Robert
Gingrich	McMillen (MD)	(OR)
Glickman	McNulty	Snowe
Gonzalez	Meyers	Solomon
Goodling	Michel	Spence
Goss	Miller (OH)	Spratt
Gradison	Miller (WA)	Stangeland
Grandy	Molinari	Stearns
Grant	Mollohan	Stenholm
Green	Montgomery	Stokes
Guarini	Moorhead	Studds
Gunderson	Morrison (WA)	Stump
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Sundquist
Hammerschmidt	Myers	Tallon
Hancock	Natcher	Tauke
Hansen	Nelson	Thomas (CA)
Harris	Nielson	Thomas (GA)
Hastert	Oakar	Torricelli
Hatcher	Ortiz	Upton
Hawkins	Oxley	Valentine
Hefley	Packard	Vander Jagt
Hefner	Parker	Visclosky
Henry	Parris	Vucanovich
Herger	Pashayan	Walker
Hertel	Patterson	Walsh
Hiler	Paxon	Watkins
Hochbrueckner	Payne (NJ)	Weber
Hopkins	Payne (VA)	Weiss
Horton	Perkins	Weldon
Houghton	Petri	Whittaker
Hubbard	Pickett	Williams
Hunter	Porter	Wilson
Hutto	Pursell	Wolf
Hyde	Quillen	Wyden
Inhofe	Ravenel	Wylie
Ireland	Ray	Yates
James	Regula	Yatron
Jenkins	Rhodes	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman	Courter	Martinez
Bilirakis	Davis	Pepper
Clay	Hall (OH)	Young (FL)

□ 1527

Messrs. VISCLOSKY, DURBIN, ROWLAND of Georgia, and DERICK changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BRYANT, WAXMAN, CONYERS, and GRAY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2072) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations and transfers, urgent supplementals, and correcting enrollment errors for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1530

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, we are a little puzzled as to what the status of the supplemental appropriation bill that we thought was pending before the House is. Has that gone somewhere?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will reply to the gentleman from California that the Committee rose without completing action on the bill. The Committee has risen. We are no longer in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2072.

It is the presumption of the Chair that the Committee intends to return that bill to the Committee and perform certain corrective surgery.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, is it necessary that we send the Committee out to look for what happened to the bill?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his question again?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Is it necessary that we send somebody out to find out where this bill went?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would respond to the gentleman that the bill is still on the Union Calendar.

The gentleman's question is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to proceed for 1 minute that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we had announced previously that if we concluded the business of the week, we would have only a pro forma session tomorrow. That was not quite what I

had in mind, but I think we have concluded the business of the week.

Accordingly, the House will be in a pro forma session tomorrow, Thursday. When the House adjourns tomorrow, we will ask that the House adjourn to meet on Monday next.

We will announce the program for next week tomorrow in consultation with the distinguished Republican leader.

Accordingly, Members should be confident of the fact that except for unexpected procedural votes, there will be no votes for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman. I imagine that any other pertinent questions with respect to maybe a little further scheduling would be more appropriate to ask tomorrow, rather than today.

I think there have been some Members who have inquired about Memorial Day, whether there was any change from our original agreement or what-not, if the distinguished majority leader would be prepared to respond to that tomorrow.

Mr. FOLEY. We hope to be able to announce by tomorrow a schedule, not only for next week, but for the month of May, at least in terms of those days on which Members should expect that there will be votes on the floor. We will announce the program specifically for next week and we hope tomorrow to be able to provide all Members with notice about each of the session days in the month of May, whether there will be votes or not.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader, because that will be most helpful to all the Members, I am sure.

Mr. FOLEY. I might say, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that we intend to do this throughout the year to provide Members before the beginning of the month with an indication of what votes will occur during that month, so far as is possible.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL TO COMMEMORATE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COELHO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this is for the use of the rotunda in two instances, is that correct?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct, in two instances.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Once is for the Holocaust that the gentleman from Illinois requested. What was the other purpose?

Mr. FROST. It is for two different years, but for the same purpose.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1540

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to express my thanks to the gentleman for making no objection to this bill. It is a necessary bill. I think it does grace to both the Commission and to the Congress for permitting the ceremony to take place and, particularly, to the Speaker for having given his consent. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing the bill up today.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Holocaust Council, I would like to take a moment to thank the Speaker of the House for the use of the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol for the purpose of commemorating the victims of the Holocaust. I also want to thank my colleagues, MARTIN FROST of Texas, BILL CLAY of Missouri, and BILL THOMAS of California for their assistance in moving House Concurrent Resolution 50 through the House.

Though it is difficult and painful to reflect upon the horrors associated with the Holocaust, it is important that we do so to prevent such a tragedy from occurring again. The "Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust" is an important part of the Holocaust Council's continuing effort to remind us all of the Holocaust and it is fitting that part of the ceremony associated with the "days of remembrance" should be held in the Capitol. I thank my colleagues in the House for their assistance and cooperation with this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], for introducing this resolution and consider it a privilege to have been asked to manage the bill today.

The Capitol rotunda is generally used for ceremonies that commemorate events that have affected the lives of all Americans. It is, therefore, appropriate that the rotunda be used to commemorate the loss of the 6 million victims of the Holocaust. It serves

the interest of our Nation to periodically remind ourselves that the most heinous crime to humanity came to pass in our lifetime.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 50

Whereas, pursuant to such Act, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council has designated April 30 through May 7, 1989, and April 22 through April 29, 1990, as "Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust"; and

Whereas, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council has recommended that a one-hour ceremony to be held at noon on May 2, 1989, and at noon on April 24, 1990, consisting of speeches, readings, and musical presentations as part of the days of remembrance activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the rotunda of the United States Capitol is hereby authorized to be used on May 2, 1989, from 8 o'clock ante meridian until 3 o'clock post meridian and on April 22, 1990, from 8 o'clock ante meridian until 3 o'clock post meridian for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FROST

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FROST: On line 2 of page 2 of the resolution, strike "22" and insert in lieu thereof "24".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 293, H.R. 1233, and H.R. 1660

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the lists of cosponsors of H.R. 293, H.R. 1233, and H.R. 1660.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DE LUGO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PALLONE ANNOUNCES HOUSE PASSAGE OF IMPACT AID AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives has approved an amendment to the Federal impact aid formula to provide needed funding to the Tinton Falls and Eatontown School Districts for the children of military personnel.

The amendment passed the U.S. Senate last week through the efforts of New Jersey Senators BILL BRADLEY and FRANK LAUTENBERG, and now goes to President Bush for his approval.

I would like to thank my colleagues for moving quickly to approve the amendment.

This legislation is vitally important to Tinton Falls and Eatontown, both located in the Third Congressional District.

Both towns are eligible for Federal impact aid because they serve a significant number of military children, but were penalized under changes in the impact aid formula enacted last year because less than 50 percent of their students are from military families.

The amendment caps Federal funds for school districts with over 50 percent military children at \$20 million, and shifts the remaining \$30 million in impact aid funds already appropriated to those districts with less than 50 percent military children.

Tinton Falls has an additional problem in that last year's changes to the impact aid formula froze funding for school districts at their previous level, regardless of the number of new military students.

Tinton Falls is faced with an influx of some 200 additional students next fall due to the expansion of the Earle Naval Weapons Station.

The amendment approved today will remove this freeze on funding and allow for additional aid if more children from military families enter the school district.

As a result of the amendment, Tinton Falls' needs of \$500,000 for the next 2 school years will be met.

When Tinton Falls' impact aid funding shortfall became apparent earlier this year, I met with local officials to pursue a strategy that would entitle Tinton Falls to the needed funds. The Third District Congressman wrote to the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee and the Subcommittee on Education of the House Appropriations Committee to urge their support for rectifying the inequity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ANNUNZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LEGISLATION TO ASSIST PROVIDING RUNNING WATER AND SEWAGE FACILITIES FOR COLONIAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to assist a number of communities along our southwestern border where residents live in housing so inadequate that they lack access to running water and sewage facilities.

In these communities, commonly known in those areas as "colonias," rates of diseases that have been eradicated in most other parts of the country are alarmingly high. Children in these communities look forward to physical education classes at school because they can bathe there, and families are forced to carry jugs of water from business establishments and nearby relatives for their use in cooking.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited these communities, and witnessed first-hand the deplorable conditions in which people must live because there is such a shortage of affordable housing in these areas. The Public Works Subcommittee on Water Resources also conducted field hearings in their communities last March, and the committee record reflects the personal stories of residents who moved their families to these communities because they sought to realize the American dream—to own a home. For some of these families, Federal housing projects posed too great a danger because of the environment they provided their children, and they chose instead to move to an area where they would have no running water but where their children could be raised in healthy neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would authorize a series of demonstration projects in six counties along the border under the Environmental Protection Agency for the installation of sewer and water supply facilities. In addition, my bill would establish a revolving loan fund to enable residents of these communities to connect their residences to such facilities. As drafted, my bill would appropriate a total of \$9.8 million for Cameron, Hidalgo, Maverick, Presidio, and El Paso County, TX, as well as Dona Ana County, NM. With these funds, the more than 100,000 residents in these communities can improve their drinking water supply and sewer systems, and as a result, improve their lives.

The State and local governments where these communities are located are trying to provide some assistance to improve the living conditions in these areas, but the problems have proven too massive for them to adequately address. In the current legislative session, the Texas Legislature has before it a proposal to issue State bonds to cover some

of the costs of these improvements. Primarily, it is because of the dangerous public health conditions posed by these communities, which are in such close proximity to Mexico, that the Federal Government should provide assistance.

I ask my colleagues to support my bill, and I thank them for their consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mrs. ROUKEMA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. LANTOS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MORE GREEN TEA AND DIRTY TRICKS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have read portions of Marvin Wolf's book, "The Japanese Conspiracy," which details how the Japanese businessman, working with the Government, have targeted American businesses.

I think of Marvin Wolf and his book everytime whenever I read news stories about United States-Japanese trade. He has shown us the road map on how we have lost our industries.

Today, I want to read the last of chapter 2 on the electronics industry. I think we can all understand better what has happened with Marvin's explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all understand better what has happened with our electronics and what is happening today in the HDTV field and others related to the electronics field. Where I had left off last time on this was talking about Stanford Ovshinsky, a brilliant inventor.

Stanford Ovshinsky is a brilliant inventor whose work in optical electronics rates an entry in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary under a newly coined word, Ovronics. In 1970 Ovshinsky patented a remarkable system for storing data on a computer memory disk. Using a laser, the Ovshinsky device can place 100 times as much information into the same space as conventional magnetic storage methods, and it can be erased or changed at will. Even though IBM was not sure what products might result from the process, in 1972 it bought a license from Ovshinsky's company, Energy Conversion Devices. ECD is a small firm based in Troy, Michigan, primarily devoted to R&D. It has fewer than 300 employees and less than \$21 million in sales, but it has been

very active in licensing Japanese companies and in forming joint ventures with them.

"We've had very good relationships in Japan up to now," explains Larry Norris, a senior VP with Ovshinsky's firm. "We have a joint venture with Sharp Corporation in the field of photovoltaics, which is now in production making solar electric cells from our amorphous silicon technology. And we're now going into calculators. We have several Japanese licensees with a chemical company and Fuji. We also have a Japanese subsidiary, and a wide range of business associates, partners, and licensees. In fact we have more business in Japan than we have in the U.S."

In April 1983, Ovshinsky was shaken to see an elegant press kit distributed by Matsushita, a \$45-billion-a-year conglomerate which proudly claimed that it had produced "an erasable optical disk for the first time in the world." Ovshinsky's firm promptly filed suit. "IBM is a licensee under this patent which is being infringed by Matsushita," says Norris. "IBM did the right thing. In 1972 it took out an insurance policy and put it in the bank. 'If we ever use the process, we'll pay you a royalty,' they told us. In Norris's opinion, 'Matsushita went ahead and just grabbed it without paying us a cent.'"

But why would a giant company like Matsushita just take someone's technology? Norris has no theory. "I can't understand this behavior. They've invested a lot of money in development, probably as much as \$100 million. Then to go out and jeopardize the whole damn thing by just blatantly infringing somebody's patent—to me it doesn't represent rational business behavior. It's stupid."

But in Tokyo, Shigeki Hijino does have a theory to explain Matsushita's behavior. Hijino is the 42-year-old editor-in-chief of Britannica International Yearbook and a prominent social critic. "Matsushita is an octopus. Everybody knows it. It's just out to grab whatever it can," he says.

Norris of Energy Conversion Devices is still shaking his head. "We took a very aggressive stance. A small company like us could have written them a letter and gotten into their corporate bureaucracy, and we could have been there for ten years, and they would just put us on hold. Maybe that's what they were relying on," Norris says, "Stan wasn't going to be put in a position like that. That's why we filed our lawsuit, and held a big press conference. They were stunned."

A few weeks later, Ovshinsky and Norris went to Congress to testify about the case before the Dingell Committee. "We talked for an hour, and Matsushita got raked over the coals," recalls Norris. "I'm sure that they didn't think that a little company of two or three hundred people was going to give them that kind of anguish. Maybe they're in a mood to talk business, now that we have their attention."

They do seem to have captured Matsushita's attention. While Matsushita continues to publicly deny that it has done anything wrong, they have initiated talks with ECD, and Ovshinsky has gone to Japan to negotiate with the giant electronics firm. "We've got a patent infringement case and if they take a license from us on patent infringement case and if they take a license from us on reasonable terms, that should settle the matter," says Norris. If Matsushita does not agree to terms, however, it could take a long time for Ovshinsky's firm to get anything out of Matsushita. Japan has comparatively

few courts and only 11,000 lawyers in the entire nation. Their judges have caseloads five or six times heavier than those of U.S. federal district judges, which makes litigation an impractical avenue for corporate redress.

One of the most popular components in home computers is a chip called the Z80, developed in 1976 by Federico Faggin, one of the maverick geniuses of America's Silicon Valley. Faggin founded Zilog to manufacture the chip, and after a few years sold his company to Exxon, returning to devote more time to his research. As personal computers rose in popularity, more and more manufacturers chose the Z80 as the CPU or "brain" of their computers. Zilog licensed three companies, including Sharp in Japan, to make the Z80 and collected a small royalty on each Z80 chip these companies sold. Several of the newest home computers are being produced by such Japanese companies as Nippon Electric Company (NEC), SORD, Fujitsu, Sony and Hitachi, and many of them have chosen to use the Z80. This chip allows software manufacturers to easily adapt many programs written for other, mostly American, computers.

In early 1983 Zilog came upon a new chip called the PD 780, produced by NEC, which was becoming a best-seller in Japan's awakening home computer markets. When Zilog took the chip apart and examined it carefully, it seemed to be an identical copy of the Z80. "There are three legitimate alternative sources—companies we licensed—for the Z80. But we are contending that NEC, which is now rivaling us for market share, is illegally producing our chip," says an angry Chuck Signor, spokesman for Zilog, which has sued NEC in the U.S. federal court. "They just went out and copied the chip and it's selling like crazy—mainly in the Japanese markets, but now also in the U.S.," Signor claims.

The Japanese are skilled, and noted, for "reverse engineering," taking someone else's product apart to see how it works, then building something that does virtually the same thing as the original. "They have their top engineers, maybe the best 5 percent of their force, working on nothing but reverse engineering," claims Ronald N. Billings, an American who has worked in the Japanese computer industry for 14 years and is now a consultant to Nihon Soft Bank, Japan's largest software company. Apparently the technique is legal or almost so. "It's a tricky business because historically reverse engineering has been considered a valid situation, even on patentable areas," says Zilog's Signor. "A person opens your chip and looks at it and tests it and tries it out. Then he goes to his R&D people and says, 'Can you put out a chip that does the same thing?' They start from scratch and they go do it. That's considered allowable in this business."

The problem, says Signor, is that he is convinced that the NEC chip is not a product of reverse engineering. "They photographed it, warts and all, the errors are still in there," he contends. "Federico Faggin, the guy who designed our chip, says it's all still in there. It's a direct copy and not an engineering development. Other companies we've licensed have paid several million dollars for the right to be a second source."

In addition to the lawsuit, Zilog has brought a complaint to the International Trade Commission, which has accepted the case. But in Japan, Zilog is powerless. "We can't prosecute them over there," says Signor. "But if we can get an ITC ruling in

our favor, the ITC will stop all imports of products with that chip in it. The ITC will settle it in nine months to a year. Unfortunately, the U.S. courts will take three to five years. That's why we went to the ITC."

□ 1550

I might inject at this point that one of the reasons some of us were fighting very hard to stop the sale of the Aegis missile cruiser to Japan last year, at least if they were going to buy it, they had to buy the entire ship from this country, but for us to do the technology part and then to send it over there while they build a ship part and assemble the two together, was because it would allow them to do the reverse engineering on the technology about 3 or 4 years ahead of time. And we lost that battle. We should not have. That is another reason why a group of us are fighting the FSX technology transfer.

I continue now with the book, "the Japanese Conspiracy," by Marvin Wolf. He points out:

This was a key reason behind the MITI campaign to match and pass the U.S. in semiconductor technology. But Japan's computer manufacturers found that competing with IBM was not easy. "We tried to sell our own machines," recalled Taiyu Kobayashi, chairman of Fujitsu, in 1982. "However, the installed base of IBM is so large and the users, quite naturally, want to use the software base they have built up over the years. The relative value of software in the computer system has risen to in excess of 70 percent of the cost of the system. Being compatible was the only way to get started in the computer business."

Kobayashi confirmed that the Japanese sales strategy—compatibility with IBM's hardware—was the keystone of an effort to cut into IBM's share of the market. But in the early years, plug-compatible Japanese-made computers were not received well, even in Japan. Despite the unpopularity of their products, the Japanese industry continued its efforts to improve them. "MITI put out R&D funds and brought together the various companies for joint development projects," confirmed Kobayashi. "When domestic makers began building products and it wasn't clear whether what we made would work or not, MITI went around to the industries that had benefited from its patronage—automobiles, steel, etc.—and said, 'Here, use these'."

□ 1600

In other words, what it amounted to was the government ordering the industry there to buy the domestic product, something that we do not do in the United States of America. As a matter of fact, our own Government does not insist that our agencies buy American products enough.

The book continues:

While they set about rationalizing the Japanese computer industry, MITI also restricted the import of foreign-made IBM computers. "There was considerable pushing and hauling about how to restructure the Japanese industry to compete with IBM," Kobayashi explained. Some in Japan wanted to merge all the companies into one giant computer corporation, but a decision

was finally made to align the companies into three groups. Fujitsu was paired with Hitachi to pursue large computer development. And just about that time, someone important quit at IBM," and went over to Japanese industry.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I will relinquish the balance of my time and will continue my report on "the Japanese Conspiracy, Their Plot To Dominate Industry Worldwide and How To Deal with It," by Marvin Wolf, at a later date.

THE PRETTY BIG PICTURE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCloskey). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about foreign and defense policy and what impact they have on our Federal budget deficits.

First, the very big picture: The cold war is over, suggest many economists, and we have won. But what has this got to do with our money?

Everything. If true it means, for starters, that we may be able to shrink the deficit without big tax hikes.

It means the 1987 stock market crash may not have signaled a looming economic collapse. It means both sides can shift military resources to more productive things.

After all, the goal of the Reagan military buildup wasn't to become so strong that we could take over the world. The Japanese—in part because they don't spend much on the military—are already taking over the world. Rather, it was to become strong enough to make the Soviets see the futility of the competition and then, from that position of strength, to negotiate meaningful reductions. Say what you will about Ronald Reagan's budget deficits, the strategy seems to have worked.

Freer markets and greater personal incentives are busting out all over—in Russia—perestroika; in China—the Chinese are launching a stock market; in the historic United States-Canada Free Trade pact; in Europe's move toward economic unification; in lower personal income-tax rates—most recently in Japan. Free trade and low tax rates are the stuff of economic growth. Combined with today's awesome pace of technological progress, they add up to what could be a very bright future.

Of course there are a few problems: the greenhouse effect, melting icecaps that may sink my coastal congressional district, drugs and crime, debt piled upon debt, terrorism; the prospect that some crazed 14-year-old with an Apple II GS might wipe out a million bank accounts. As always, there is lots to lose sleep over. As always, we are dancing across the high wire. But we have made some encouraging progress.

Now for the pretty big picture.

For years, we've been consuming more than we've been producing. Given the first law of economics—that there's no free lunch—you have to wonder how we've pulled this off. We've done it by saving next to nothing, which imperils our future, and by going deep into hock, which imperils it further. We've been importing VCR's and, to pay for them, selling real estate and major corporations. After 5 or 10 years, when the VCR's break down, we won't get the buildings or businesses back. We'll just have to sell others.

We've been saying that it's better to borrow the money to buy a \$45,000 German car than to buy a \$12,000 American car and invest the remaining \$33,000 in our future.

Sooner or later, to get things back in balance, America will have to consume less and/or produce more. Consuming less won't necessarily lead to recession, as it might have in the old days. With the dollar so low, and with the Japanese and others so flush, we'll be busily employed making things for them. Until we do consumer less or produce more, our wealth and competitive strength will just continue to drain off, like a big swimming pool with a slow leak.

How will America ever balance its budget? Continued economic growth, combined with modest revenue enhancement, modest cuts in the \$300 billion defense budget, would head us in the right direction.

As for all those suddenly unemployed military men and women, redeploying 100,000 of them to civilian duty as high school teachers might help to get our toughest inner-city kids off crack and onto reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Actually, it's not necessary to try to wipe out the deficit entirely—at least not right away. The trick is to keep it trending down and keep the economy growing. Right now, our \$2.5 trillion national debt equals 50 percent of our \$5 trillion gross national product. At the end of World War II, our deficit was 127 percent of the GNP. If the economy should continue to expand at 7 percent a year, through real growth and inflation, it would reach \$10 trillion in 1999. If, over that same decade, we ran annual \$100 billion deficits, the total debt would have grown to \$3.5 trillion—but it would have shrunk to just 35 percent of the GNP.

Maybe with a little common sacrifice and common sense we can get our fiscal house in order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. BILIRAKIS (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TALLON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LELAND, for 60 minutes, on April 27.

Mr. OWENS of New York, for 60 minutes, each day on May 3 and 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JAMES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISH.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. BUECHNER.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. LOWERY of California.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. SPENCE.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. WHITTAKER.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. FIELDS in two instances.

Mr. HYDE in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. DANNEMEYER.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DARDEN.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN.

Mr. ERDREICH.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. FAUNTROY.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. NOWAK.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. MFUME in two instances.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. BRYANT.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. FOLEY.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 7, 1989, through May 14, 1989, as "Jewish Heritage Week";

S.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to express gratitude for law enforcement personnel;

S.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to designate April 30, 1989, as "National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution Centennial Day"; and

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to invite the houses of worship of this Nation to celebrate the bicentennial of the inauguration of George Washington, the first President of the United States, by ringing bells at 12 noon on Sunday, April 30, 1989.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 27, 1989, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1055. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the special report on services for older Indians prepared by the Administration on Aging, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3057b; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1056. A letter from the Director, Information Security Oversight Office, transmitting a copy of the office's "Annual Report to the President FY 1988," and a copy of the President's letter in response to the report; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1057. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure prescribed by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075 (H. Doc. No. 101-54); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1058. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure which have been adopted by the

Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075 (H. Doc. No. 53); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1059. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure prescribed by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075 (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1060. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on children in foster care under voluntary placement agreements for fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 672 note; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1061. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the airport and airway tax reduction trigger; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1062. A letter from the Board of Trustees, transmitting the 1989 annual report of the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance and the Federal disability insurance trust funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), 1395t(b)(2) (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1063. A letter from the Board of Trustees, the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 1989 annual report of the board of trustees of the Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), 1395t(b)(2) (H. Doc. No. 57); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1486, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes (Rep. 101-40). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 2109. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the District of Columbia for additional officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, to provide for the implementation in the District of Columbia of a community-oriented policing system, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the District of Columbia, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2110. A bill to provide for obtaining additional Federal prison facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DE

LUGO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. YATES, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ECKART, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2111. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish programs to increase the supply of professional nurses and provide educational assistance to nurses and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2112. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to prevent unwarranted accumulation of amounts in escrow accounts of home buyers with federally related mortgage loans; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 2113. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to ensure that farmland held by the Farmers Home Administration is sold at fair market value to qualified persons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2114. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that all veterans eligible to receive educational assistance under the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program have 10 years after discharge or release from active duty in which to pursue a program of education with such assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRENNAN:

H.R. 2115. A bill to prohibit the introduction of a plastic container into interstate commerce that is not labeled to indicate the type of plastic resin used to produce the container; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H.R. 2116. A bill to amend section 7 of the Mineral Leasing Act governing Federal coal lease royalty rates; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas (for himself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 2117. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a demonstration program for installation of sewer and water supply facilities for certain colonias in the State of Texas and to establish a revolving loan fund to enable residents of such colonias to connect their residences to such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2118. A bill to benefit the U.S. Coast Guard by assessing a user fee on recreational vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H.R. 2119. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain Federal public land in Madison County, IL; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 2120. A bill to amend the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of the act for fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992; jointly, to the Committees on For-

eign Affairs, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Colorado):

H.R. 2121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals for an indefinite period, and to increase the amount of such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.R. 2122. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to exclude receipts and disbursements of the Social Security trust funds from the calculation of Federal deficits and maximum deficit amounts under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FLORIO (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. SIKORSKI):

H.R. 2123. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to extend coverage of certain requirements relating to asbestos in schools to include public and commercial buildings and to strengthen such requirements; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLORIO (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2124. A bill to establish minimum standards for health insurance coverage of drug and alcohol abuse treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 2125. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide free insurance up to the value of \$100 on mail items; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2126. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to Provide Books for the Adult Blind" to provide clarification with respect to the individuals who may make diagnoses of dyslexia under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACHTLEY (for himself, Mr. EARLY, and Mr. ATKINS):

H.R. 2127. A bill to amend Public Law 99-647, establishing the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission, to authorize the Commission to take immediate action in furtherance of its purposes and to increase the authorization of appropriations for the Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE of Virginia:

H.R. 2128. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require that substantial rate increases in rates charged by cable television operators be subject to approval by local regulatory authorities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ECKART, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. LELAND):

H.R. 2129. A bill to establish a U.S. Boxing Corporation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

H.R. 2130. A bill to require that not less than 25 percent of amounts spent by the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1990 for advertising for military recruiting purposes be spent for advertising in newspapers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 2131. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit certain practices in the use of automatic dialing devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia:

H.R. 2132. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts otherwise includible on the surrender or cancellation of any life insurance policy which are used to pay long-term care insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts withdrawn from individual retirement plans for payment of long-term care insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida (for himself, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. McCURDY, and Mrs. LLOYD):

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to authorize the distribution of wholesome meat for human consumption that has been condemned under that act to charity and public agencies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. AU COIN, and Mr. SKAGGS):

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to improve compliance by Federal facilities with the requirements of subtitle C of that act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BLILEY, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 2136. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code to limit the length of time for which an individual may be incarcerated for civil contempt in a child custody case in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia and to provide for expedited appeal procedures to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for individuals found in civil contempt in such a case; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution designating July 4 of each year as the "Principal National Permanent Legal Holiday"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. McHUGH):

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 4, 1989, through June 10, 1989, as "National Intelligence Community Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. FISH):

H.J. Res. 252. Joint resolution designating May 1989 as "National Water Recreation Safety Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ATKINS:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution urging first asylum countries of the Association of Southeast Asia Nations [ASEAN] to reinstate the practice of providing refuge to all asylum seekers from Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H. Res. 139. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the future of America's family-owned farms and businesses would be jeopardized by any increase in estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BATES, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 140. Resolution expressing the sense of the House regarding the critical need to include the use of alternative fuels such as ethanol, produced from our abundant stocks of surplus grain, methanol, which can be produced from our vast coal reserves, and compressed natural gas which can be produced from abundant gas reserves in air pollution control strategies required by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency to achieve compliance with the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida (for himself, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. SHAW):

H. Res. 141. Resolution relating to the restoration of Eastern Airlines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

71. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Alaska salmon and steelhead on the high seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

72. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the air service subsidy program; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

73. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the location of a repository for nuclear waste in Nevada; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

74. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the placement of a repository for high-level radioactive waste in Nevada; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. FORD of Michigan and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 19: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 21: Mr. GARCIA and Mr. CONTE.

H.R. 22: Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 41: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 42: Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 48: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 77: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 82: Mr. REGULA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 84: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 85: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 88: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 89: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 109: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 118: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. HILER.

H.R. 182: Mr. FRANK, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LENT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BATES, Mr. ROE, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. DREIER of California.

H.R. 212: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 214: Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 215: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BATES, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 220: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 222: Ms. LONG, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 245: Mr. DREIER of California.

H.R. 403: Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 425: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 458: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 467: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 499: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 501: Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 581: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ROE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H.R. 583: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 615: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 631: Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 670: Mr. WEISS, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 673: Mr. MANTON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 675: Mr. COX.

H.R. 711: Mr. SMITH of Vermont and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 725: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 778: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ESPY, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 791: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BATES, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 795: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 798: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 799: Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 800: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 833: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 844: Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 850: Mr. CRANE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. ROE, and Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 901: Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 904: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YATES, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. CARR, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BROWDER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. STERN, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 928: Mr. FORD of Michigan and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1000: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1025: Mr. COX and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 1046: Mr. HASTERT and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 1048: Mr. WALGREN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1074: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SUNQUIST, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. PRICE.

H.R. 1078: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 1112: Mr. OLIN, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1117: Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 1124: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1131: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 1133: Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 1136: Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. WISE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1142: Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. PENNY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1154: Mr. LEVINE of California and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 1180: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1181: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 1199: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CARPER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. BATES, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 1210: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. HERGER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1216: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LELAND, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.R. 1243: Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 1281: Mr. COURTER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1295: Mr. HEFNER and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 1337: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr.

JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1352: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1371: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1381: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 1382: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 1383: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1387: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 1394: Mr. FRANK, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 1441: Mr. PENNY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PEASE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. UPTON, Mr. YATES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1465: Mr. SWIFT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 1471: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 1494: Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 1499: Mr. WALSH, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1504: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 1526: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 1553: Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 1568: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1573: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 1589: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1605: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MOODY, Mr. YATES, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. PENNY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1609: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 1610: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1617: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. HYDE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 1631: Mr. BENNETT and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1651: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1654: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. WOLFE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1659: Mr. KOLTER and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1676: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1677: Mr. STARK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. COLEMAN of

Texas, Mr. ROE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 1679: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BATES, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1691: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1693: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BATES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 1725: Mr. FUSTER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1730: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 1845: Mr. DYMALLY and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 1861: Mr. VENTO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FAWELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1931: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1935: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CONTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2008: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. STANGELAND.

H.R. 2044: Mr. HORTON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 2055: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. OLIN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. PAXON.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. UPTON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. RITTER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WELDON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HERGER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. PICKETT.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. WOLFE and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HOCHERUECKNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.J. Res. 107: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. APPLEGATE, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 120: Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.J. Res. 132: Mr. SABO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SHARP, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr.

NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.J. Res. 138: Mr. OLIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BATES, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.J. Res. 141: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. McDADE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. BUNNING.

H.J. Res. 164: Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PARKER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.J. Res. 186: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. FISH, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SABO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.J. Res. 199: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.J. Res. 210: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FRENZEL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KAPTUR, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WISE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STUMP, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. McHUGH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. EARLY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. QUILLLEN, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 214: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.J. Res. 216: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BATES, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COURTER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McMILLAN of

Maryland, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RAY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ROTH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.J. Res. 226: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WISE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.J. Res. 240: Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McNULTY,

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YATRON.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. FLORIO.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. COX and Mr. CLEMENT.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. DREIER of California and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. PEASE, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. WEISS.

H. Res. 95: Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. FAWELL.

H. Res. 122: Mr. BUNNING.

H. Res. 128: Mr. FRANK, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. GILMAN.

H. Res. 129: Mr. FLORIO, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. CONYERS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 293: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1233: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1660: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.J. Res. 137: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

33. By the SPEAKER: Petition of city of Irving, TX, relative to the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

34. Also, petition of Waller County, Hempstead, TX, relative to the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

35. Also, petition of Ray Sealy, Limestone County judge, Grosbeck, TX, relative to the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.